

Leon County Schools

Sealey Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Sealey Elementary School

2815 ALLEN RD, Tallahassee, FL 32312

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

Demographics

Principal: Demetria Clemons

Start Date for this Principal: 5/22/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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.

Sealey Elementary Math and Science Magnet School prepares students to be responsible, respectful and independent learners who will grow in his/her intellectual, physical and emotional development in a way that increases academic performance and encourages student and school success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Sealey Elementary Community is dedicated to the process of engaging successful, safe and respectful academic achievers who appreciate diversity and the foundations of the learning environment in order to foster a spirit that conscientiously contributes to our society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McHargue, Laurie	Guidance Counselor	Referral coordinator, 504 coordinator, Threat and suicide assessment team member, PBIS coordinator
Clemons, Demetria	Principal	Financial administrator, parent and community communication, data collection and communication, staffing plan manager, lead administrator in site-based decision making
Thorbjornsen, Jeanne	Attendance/ Social Work	Parent and community communication, employs community resources related to social work needs
Kidd, Heather	Paraprofessional	School-wide behavior specialist, develops and implements targeted behavior plans, parent communication, MTSS team member
Cloud, Clayton	Assistant Principal	Title I administrator, parent and community communication, data collection and communication, faculty and staff professional development, lead administrator in site-based decision making in absence of principal
Lato, Amy	Psychologist	MTSS team member, evaluates and assesses students based on data collection and concerns stemming from parents and school
Bryant, Laurel	Teacher, K-12	Tier III interventionist, data collection and communication, MTSS team member
Reece, Christopher	Teacher, ESE	ESE office of compliance, MTSS team member
Husband, Judith	Other	ESE behavior program specialist, evaluates and assesses students based on data collection and concerns stemming from parents and school, MTSS team member
Camoegas, Laura	Instructional Coach	Reading coach, data collection and communication, STAR/ AIMS Web/ FLKRS, STAR EL, AR coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 5/22/2020, Demetria Clemons

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	79	74	81	80	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	4	0	4	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 5/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	88	92	86	85	82	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	9	14	9	11	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	3	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	11	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	88	92	86	85	82	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	9	14	9	11	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	3	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	11	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	57%	57%	61%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	54%	58%	55%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	47%	53%	34%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	64%	63%	56%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	63%	62%	46%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	51%	37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	52%	53%	53%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
	2018	45%	58%	-13%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	52%	56%	-4%	56%	-4%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	63%	5%	62%	6%
	2018	66%	64%	2%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	66%	2%	64%	4%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	64%	61%	3%	60%	4%
	2018	47%	58%	-11%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	41	45	37	38	40	21				
ELL		60			80						
BLK	57	57	54	64	64	41	41				
MUL	60			70							
WHT	73	60		77	72		60				
FRL	54	59	56	64	66	53	44				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	33	45	35	36	61	50	27				
ELL	36			36							
BLK	51	40	27	53	55	50	24				
HSP	36	40		73	60						
WHT	69	57		60	62	45	60				
FRL	46	44	39	46	59	54	37				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	32	36	27	32	17					
ELL	39	62		39	54						
ASN	90			90							
BLK	53	43	30	43	42	32	33				
HSP	45			55							
WHT	69	66	45	69	51	50	71				
FRL	46	38	33	40	43	39	33				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
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 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	68
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Approximately 40% of students in grades 3-5 scored below the proficiency benchmark on the last STAR reading progress monitoring assessment. There was a higher percentage of 3rd grade students scoring below proficiency.

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

3rd grade students scoring above the proficiency benchmark on the last STAR reading progress monitoring assessment decreased from 71% in 2018-2019 to 61% in 2019-2020. Students new to the school who may have been unidentified as having an academic need.

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.

Both our math learning gains in our lowest quartile and science achievement fell below the state average. Identified factors included missing foundational skills, including concepts, vocabulary, and the necessary experiences to better perform on these assessments.

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

5th grade students scoring above the proficiency benchmark on the last STAR reading progress monitoring assessment increased from 44% in 2018-2019 to 61% in 2019-2020. Increased rigor using a more strategic pacing guide.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance of students leaving 3rd grade and entering 4th grade is significantly lower than all other grade levels. Additionally, the same group of students experienced a higher number of suspensions, resulting in lost instructional time.

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

1. Assessment performance of SWD
2. ELA learning gains
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ESE or Students with Disabilities subgroup did not meet the 41% requirement as outline in ESSA from 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to increase this subgroup performance as measured by ESSA standards to at least the minimum requirement of 41% in the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with Disabilities will participate in intensive, small group instruction to remediate academic learning gaps, but also increase exposure to complex questioning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be assessed to determine academic deficiencies in order to provide remediation on targeted skills. Additionally, they will be provided guided practice with frequent feedback in a small group setting on high complexity skills to improve reading comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Collect previous year's and maintain current progress monitoring data to determine deficit skills, adapting as needed. Smaller groups will be used for more intensive remediation. ESE and support staff will push-in to the regular education classrooms to provide scaffolded support during grade level instruction. Monthly data chats will be held by administration with teachers to track student progress and determine further action steps. The MTSS team will be involved to review student data and determine if further evaluation is necessary.

Person Responsible Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Review individual/ skill deficiencies

Person Responsible Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Monitor student performance on classroom and progress monitoring assessments

Person Responsible Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Provide higher complexity lessons with appropriate scaffolding to increase exposure

Person Responsible Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to ELA learning gains**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Learning gains as shown on STAR: Reading dropped for grades 3-5

Measurable Outcome:

At least 60% of students will show learning gains as shown on the progress monitoring assessment: STAR: Reading.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Students will be provided intensive instruction on high complexity skills

**Rationale for Evidence-
based Strategy:**

Students will be provided guided practice with frequent feedback on high complexity skills to increase exposure and improve reading comprehension

Action Steps to Implement

Collect previous year's and maintain current progress monitoring data to determine deficit skills. Small groups will be used for more intensive remediation. Monthly data chats will be held by administration, school-wide behavior specialist, and instructional coach with teachers to track student progress and determine further action steps. The MTSS team will be involved to review student data and determine if evaluation is necessary.

Person Responsible

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

2. Review high complexity standards and create a pacing guide for instruction

Person Responsible

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

3. Observe instruction

Person Responsible

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

4. Monitor student performance on classroom and progress monitoring assessments

Person Responsible

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

5. Provide higher complexity lessons with appropriate scaffolding to increase exposure

Person Responsible

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will also address daily attendance. Administration will provide communication to parents about the importance of consistent daily attendance as it relates to school success. The appropriate designees, including teacher, guidance counselor, administration, and social worker, will meet to discuss patterns of absenteeism and work with the families and District staff to resolve any concerns that are impeding the student from attending. District and state policy will be followed with the documentation and reporting of chronic absenteeism.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Sealey communicates school information to our families through a variety of formats: school newsletter, school Facebook page, listserv, Parent Portal, and the school website. In addition, teachers send home weekly reports, and newsletters to keep the parents informed of individual classroom information. Teachers also communicate with families through individual notes, emails, text messages, and web pages.

At the beginning of the year, grade levels host an open house so that parents can learn firsthand the expectations and routines of their children's classrooms, and all teachers hold a conference with parents during the first semester.

Throughout the year, the school invites parents to numerous activities held at Sealey, including the Veteran's Day Assembly, Science Night, Black History Assembly, the school talent show, strings and chorus performances, and Family Literacy Night.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA learning gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00