

Leon County Schools

Sealey Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Sealey Elementary School

2815 ALLEN RD, Tallahassee, FL 32312

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

Demographics

Principal: Demetria Clemons

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2020-21 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	2020-21: (35%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Clemons, Demetria	Principal		Financial administrator, parent and community communication, data collection and communication, staffing plan manager, lead administrator in site-based decision making
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
Thorbjornsen , Jeanne	Attendance/ Social Work		Parent and community communication, employs community resources related to social work needs
Parnell, Amy	Behavior Specialist		ESE behavior program specialist, evaluates and assesses students based on data collection and concerns stemming from parents and school, MTSS team member
McHargue, Laurie	Guidance Counselor		Referral coordinator, 504 coordinator, Threat and suicide assessment team member, PBIS coordinator
Hess, Danielle	Reading Coach		Reading coach, data collection and communication, STAR/ AIMS Web/ FLKRS, STAR EL, AR coordinator
Kidd, Heather	Paraprofessional		School-wide behavior specialist, develops and implements targeted behavior plans, parent communication, MTSS team member
Reece, Christopher	Staffing Specialist		ESE office of compliance, MTSS team member
Lato, Amy	Psychologist		MTSS team member, evaluates and assesses students based on data collection and concerns stemming from parents and school
Bryant, Laurel	Other	Interventionist	Tier III interventionist, data collection and communication, MTSS team member
Daymond, Sonja	Other	Interventionist	Tier III interventionist, data collection and communication, MTSS team member

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/24/2021, 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

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

425

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

2

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	66	77	72	67	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	13	13	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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

Thursday 8/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%			61%	57%	57%	57%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	46%			61%	54%	58%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%			56%	47%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	33%			69%	64%	63%	58%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	16%			68%	63%	62%	59%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	18%			47%	45%	51%	51%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	40%			48%	52%	53%	43%	52%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	63%	5%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	66%	2%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	61%	3%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

K-2: STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, STAR Math, AIMS Web, FLKRS (K only), curriculum assessments

3-5: STAR Reading, STAR Math, AIMS Web, FSA, curriculum assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69	77	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	20	40
	Students With Disabilities	60	44	44
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	35	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	20	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	33
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	60	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	100	100
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	39	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	55	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	39	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	56	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	30	30	30
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	44	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	10	20	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	51	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	38	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	50	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	29	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	25	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

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	18	45		15	9		9				
BLK	45	40	29	25	7	8	33				
HSP	40			20							
MUL	50			50							
WHT	65	60		54	40		60				
FRL	34	38	64	16	9	21	15				
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							

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	30
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	50
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	56
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	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

As a whole, Sealey's reading and especially our math scores decreased from previous years. No grade level had more than 50% proficient on any of the progress monitoring administrations for math.

Additionally, Sealey's sub-populations of Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners showing proficiency were much lower than those of the rest of the student population.

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

Sealey's math scores overall demonstrate the greatest need of improvement. No grade level had more than 50% proficient on any of the progress monitoring administrations for math; whereas, the school had an overall proficiency of 69% on the 2019 FSA Math assessment.

Sealey must also continue to address the performance of our various sub-populations, specifically Students with Disabilities due to also not meeting the ESSA requirements.

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

Contributing factors included the missed direct instructional time due to the COVID-19 pandemic. New skills could not be built upon the multiple gaps that were created from this lack of instruction.

All students will be in the building, but two additional intervention teachers will be used to pull out and push into classroom to help fill gaps left by the pandemic.

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

Although reading did have a decrease in the amount proficient on progress monitoring assessments based upon previous years, it still had close to or more than 50% proficient. This wasn't near as significant a drop from the 61% proficient from the 2019 FSA ELA assessment.

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

Sealey felt that reading instruction does not lend to gaps in learning because of the cyclical nature of instruction. Although students need build upon each other each year, skills are not separated by grade level as math skills.

Although we did not use anything new, we continued to use pull out programs to assist with reading instruction.

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

During our grade-level intervention blocks, we will also hold acceleration groups. These groups will focus on going deeper in comprehension skills using literary discussions and novel studies, extend writing instruction, and do more cross-curricular learning.

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.

Sealey will hold professional development on accelerated academics from district personnel working directly with our talented and gifted teacher. We will also work on extension activities within the classroom and improving cross-curricular instruction.

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

Sealey will assess the impact of providing a second intervention teacher and the results of student achievement and learning gains. We will be looking closely at the effect of the math pull-out instruction done across all grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Sealey experienced a dramatic drop in our math scores across all testing grade levels. Our focus will be on increasing math gains, which was at 16%.
Measurable Outcome:	Sealey plans to raise our overall learning gain percentage to at least 35% of tested students.
Monitoring:	Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as STAR Math and iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sealey has added two intervention specialist to assist with remediating targeted students through small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sealey's intervention specialist will be using a variety of strategies and resources, including Go Math interventions, Zearn, and the iReady Teacher Toolbox to "fill in the gaps" of pre-requisite and grade level skills. This will also allow the students to receive grade level instruction since their performance will be assessed using a state-wide assessment on grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Progress monitoring administration and data collection

Person Responsible Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Evaluation and feedback

Person Responsible Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Communication with stakeholders

Person Responsible Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the Federal Index and in relation to the Every Student Succeeds Act, students with disabilities did not meet the minimum 41%, only being at 36%

Measurable Outcome: Sealey would like to see our students with disabilities meet the minimum requirement of 41%

Monitoring: Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as STAR Math and iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Sealey's resource teachers will provide pull-out and push-in services for eligible students. This will allow identified students to receive grade level curriculum, but also small group instruction to provide opportunities for remediation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Sealey has found that having students receive instruction in the regular education classroom with non-disabled peers can be beneficial, especially if their proficiency is measured on a state-wide assessment on grade level standards. However, if teachers are able to provide the proper support and "fill in the gaps" students will have an easier time understanding and applying those skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Progress monitoring administration and data collection

Person Responsible Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Evaluation and feedback

Person Responsible Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Communication to stakeholders

Person Responsible Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Sealey's reading proficiency and learning gains dropped significantly from years' past.

Measurable Outcome:

Sealey hopes to increase our proficiency and learning gains percentages at all tested grade levels.

3rd grade- Proficiency from 43% to 45%

4th grade- Proficiency from 49% to 51%

5th grade- Proficiency from 48% to 50% and learning gains from 46% to 48%

Monitoring:

Administration will conduct data chats on a bi-monthly basis to review student progress in the general curriculum, as well as on district progress monitoring measures such as STAR Reading and iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Sealey has added two intervention specialist to assist with remediating targeted students through small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Sealey's intervention specialist will be using a variety of strategies and resources, including Wonders interventions, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, the iReady Teacher Toolbox, etc. This will allow the students to receive grade level instruction and "fill in any gaps" from previous years.

Action Steps to Implement

Progress monitoring administration and data collection

Person Responsible

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Evaluation and feedback

Person Responsible

Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Communication with stakeholders

Person Responsible

Demetria Clemons (clemonsd@leonschools.net)

Creation and scheduling of multiple intervention small groups for identified students

Sealey's intervention specialists will be using a variety of strategies and resources, including Wonders interventions, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, the iReady Teacher Toolbox, etc. This will allow the students to receive grade level instruction and "fill in any gaps" from previous years.

Person Responsible

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Sealey's discipline data fell into the "Low" category as compared to the state's metrics, having only 0.2 incidents per 100 students. We will continue using our Positive Behavior System, school-wide expectations, and remain proactive to ensure a safe learning environment for all students.

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.

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.

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

Administration-Will routinely communicate with parents and the community expectations, information, and feedback, evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, materials, and performances, manage the distribution of funds and resources to provide support for student safety and learning

Faculty and staff-Provide effective instruction using District adopted curriculum or research-based supplemental programs, maintain positive working relationships with parents, students, and school staff, complete responsibilities to promote the healthy functioning of the school environment, i.e. maintenance, instructional support, clerical duties.

Guidance counselor- Works with teachers and parents to identify students in need of small group or individual counseling on topics such as divorce, friendship, death, and anger management. In addition, they will coordinate the mentoring program at Sealey so that students in need of extra support can meet with an adult mentor weekly.

District staff-Participate in the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) team to meet weekly to review the data of

students who were referred to the team by their teachers and to make recommendations as to how to proceed to ensure the students receive necessary support. In addition, the Behavior Team meets regularly and is focused on reviewing behavioral referrals and on making recommendations as to how to proceed to provide a differentiated delivery of services based on students' needs.

Parents and community members-Work to build healthy working relationships with teachers and school staff members, communicate concerns and seek feedback to help support students at home, participate in school and community events

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00