Leon County Schools

Sealey Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sealey Elementary School

2815 ALLEN RD, Tallahassee, FL 32312

https://www.leonschools.net/sealey

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.

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, 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
Clemons, Demetria	Principal	Responsible for the management of all school functions
Cloud, Clayton	Assistant Principal	Assist in the management of all school functions.
Bryant, Laurel	Instructional Coach	Responsible for Tier 3 interventions for primary students
Daymond, Sonja	Instructional Coach	Responsible for Tier 3 interventions for intermediate students
Hess, Danielle	Reading Coach	Responsible for the management of Reading curriculum, interventions, and progress monitoring
Kidd, Heather	Behavior Specialist	Responsible for assisting in managing classroom behavior and implementing behavior plans
Lato, Amy	Psychologist	Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students brought to the MTSS team
Parnell, Amy	Behavior Specialist	Responsible for the evaluation and reporting of students with behavior concerns brought to the MTSS team
Obert, Kristen	Staffing Specialist	Responsible for ensuring state and federal compliance when considering students to receive exceptional students services
Thorbjornsen, Jeanne	Other	Social Worker; Responsible for communicating with families to provide resources within the community to assist with home and school life
Crews, Jennifer	School Counselor	Social Worker; Responsible for communicating with families to provide resources within the community to assist with home and school life
Hayes, Chandra	School Counselor	Responsible for tracking student evaluations, parent requests, and interventions within the MTSS/ RtI process. Coordinates meetings with staff and parents. 504 Coordinator for the school
Lock, Anne Marie	Other	Responsible for evaluating students based on speech and language concerns. Provides therapy services to identified students.

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.

SIP Committee consisting of leadership and teachers meets to discuss previous year's state testing data and ESSA results. Team discusses reasonable growth and identifies strategies that can be used to achieve those goals, as well as recognize barriers that will need to be overcome. Once drafted, the SIP goes before SAC for approval with an public forum for discussion and possible revision.

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 leadership team will monitor student progress quarterly and hold data meetings with grade level to discuss how to best support meeting the SIP goals. This progress will communicated at quarterly SAC meetings so all stakeholders are aware on the school's continuous improvement efforts.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	7	7	10	8	9	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	15	12	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	2	8	5	6	0	0	0	25

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

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

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	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	4	2	6	6	5	4	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	6	16	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	16	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	4	4	15	13	15	0	0	0	56

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	0	1	4	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	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	4	2	6	6	5	4	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	6	16	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	16	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	4	4	15	13	15	0	0	0	56

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	0	1	4	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	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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*	56	58	56	61	57	57
ELA Learning Gains	64	60	61	61	54	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41	49	52	56	47	53
Math Achievement*	51	58	60	69	64	63
Math Learning Gains	64	60	64	68	63	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60	48	55	47	45	51
Science Achievement*	38	50	51	48	52	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress				50		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	40	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP				
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	48			

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	56	64	41	51	64	60	38					
SWD	37	42	36	34	68	53	13					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52	62	38	44	62	56	26					
HSP												
MUL	39	60		44	60							
PAC												

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
WHT	78	80		76	80							
FRL	47	63	44	42	61	55	27					

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	49	46	41	33	16	18	40					
SWD	18	45		15	9		9					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	40	29	25	7	8	33					
HSP	40			20								
MUL	50			50								
PAC												
WHT	65	60		54	40		60					
FRL	34	38	64	16	9	21	15					

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	61	61	56	69	68	47	48					50
SWD	31	41	45	37	38	40	21					
ELL		60			80							50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	57	54	64	64	41	41					
HSP												
MUL	60			70								
PAC												
WHT	73	60		77	72		60					
FRL	54	59	56	64	66	53	44					50

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	49%	55%	-6%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	52%	-4%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	50%	-13%	51%	-14%

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.

As a whole, Sealey's reading and math scores decreased from previous years. No tested grade levels had more than 58% proficient on the statewide reading assessment. Math proficiency also suffered with no tested grade level having more than 52% proficiency.

Additionally, Sealey's sub-population of Students with Disabilities showing proficiency remained below the 41% threshold on the federal index for the second consecutive year.

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

The greatest decline was our third grade math proficiency score. On the 2022 statewide assessment, 65% of third grade students met proficiency. On the 2023 statewide assessment, only 51% met proficiency.

This grade level had the largest population of Students with Disabilities; nearly 20% of the students were eligible for services. This impact, which also shows with not meeting the 41% federal threshold, was a contributing factor to the grade level's drop in math scores.

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.

Overall the greatest gap existed with our students' proficiency on the Math assessment. In third grade, 51% demonstrated proficiency as compared to the state average of 59%. Fourth grade had 49% of students demonstrating proficiency as compared to the state average of 61%. Fifth grade had 45% of students demonstrate proficiency as compared to the state average of 55%.

Additionally, only 38% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency on the Science assessment as compared to the state average of 51%.

We are continuing to see students recovering from the pandemic years where many gaps were left, especially in mathematical thinking and reasoning.

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

The data component with the most improvement was seen in the 5th grade Math proficiency. On the 2022 statewide assessment, only 25% of the students met proficiency. However on the 2023 statewide assessment, 5th grade students reached 45% proficiency in Math

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

One area of concern is the number of students scoring an Level 1 Achievement Level on the statewide ELA assessment (29).
Another concern is the number of students with attendance below 90% (44).

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

1. Continued support and improvement for Students with Disabilities
2. Monitoring and intervening when noticing patterns of poor attendance
3. Increase support and development for Math instruction
4. Increase support and intervention strategies for Reading
5. Increase performance on Science assessment

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

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 40%

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

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

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

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 FAST, STAR, Lexia, and Waggle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@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.)

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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

According to our Early Warning System indicators, there were 44 students who were absent 10% or more of school days. That was approximately 10% of our student population.

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

Sealey would like to lower the amount of students absent 10% or more of the available school days by 5 students.

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

Weekly attendance reports will be pulled to track student attendance. Monthly meetings with Sealey's attendance committee will be held to discuss ways to intervene.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@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.)

Sealey's attendance committee, comprised of administration, guidance, social worker, and teachers, will work to develop plans of actions, which can include community resources, possible transportation, and before/ after school care.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Childcare and transportation have been notable barriers for some families with students having poor attendance. Understanding and attempting to address these barriers may lead to improve school attendance.

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 Math

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.

Sealey experienced a large discrepancy in the percentage of students proficient on the Math assessment, 48%, as compared to the State average, 58%. Our focus will be on increasing Math proficiency, closing the gap with the State's average.

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

Sealey plans to raise our overall proficiency percentage to at least 52% of tested students.

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

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 FAST, STAR Math and Waggle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Sealey's intervention specialist will be using a variety of strategies and resources, including Go Math interventions, Zearn, and Waggle to "fill in the gaps" of prerequisite 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.

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

#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.

Sealey experienced a slight discrepancy in the percentage of students proficient on the ELA assessment, 52%, as compared to the State average, 54%. Our focus will be on increasing ELA proficiency, closing the gap with the State's average.

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

Sealey would like our overall ELA proficiency to reach 55%

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

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 FAST, STAR, and Lexia

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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

#5. 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.

Sealey saw a decreased from 39% to 38% on the 5th grade Science assessment.

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

Sealey will have at least 40% of the tested students demonstrate proficiency on the statewide science assessment.

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

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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clayton Cloud (cloudc@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.)

Science standards will be broken down by complexity and hands-on application

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing on complex science concepts and providing more hands-on application, students will become more
familiar with the scientific process and important vocabulary.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Once funding allocations are received, the school improvement committee reviews the School Improvement Plan to determine the greatest need of students as determined by the previous year's data collection and analysis. Improvement plans are developed looking at site-based, District, and out-of-county professional development and training opportunities. These opportunities are presented to the School Advisory Council for discussion, approval, and, ultimately, effectiveness.

Moreover, Sealey is in the State's Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) category due to our Students with Disabilities (SWD) sub-population not meeting the 41% threshold on the Federal index. These students are often represented within our planning for improvement goals, but special attention is paid to opportunities that could specifically impact this sub-population, and follow a similar path when reviewing funding allocations as stated previously.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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

Not applicable

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

At Sealey, 51% of tested third grade students did not demonstrate proficiency on the statewide 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 coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Not applicable

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is that at least 55% of our matched 3rd grade students will demonstrate proficiency on the state-wide ELA assessment.

Monitoring

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

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 FAST, STAR, and Lexia.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cloud, Clayton, cloudc@leonschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

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

Sealey has added two intervention specialist to assist with remediating targeted students through small group instruction.
Sealey's intervention specialists will be using a variety of strategies and resources, including Savvas interventions, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Lexia, etc.

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

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

This targeted, small group intervention will allow the students to receive grade level instruction during their regular ELA instructional block and have the intervention block to "fill in any gaps" from previous years.

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
Establish Vertical Content Collaboration Sessions to create Literacy Outcome Goals and provide professional development for appropriate ELA instruction.	Clemons, Demetria, clemonsd@leonschools.net
Reading Coach will collaborate weekly with all grade level teams to analyze progress monitoring data, plan instruction, and share current research-based best practices and resources to maximize student achievement. Reading Coach will model and observe classroom instruction, as well as provide feedback in order to facilitate a systemic shift in the school's instructional capacity, increasing the teacher collective efficacy and thereby positively impacting student growth. MyView-Savvas formative and summative assessments, Lexia Core5, AR, AimsWeb, and STAR data will be used to help drive instructional decisions.	Clemons, Demetria, clemonsd@leonschools.net

Title I Requirements

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

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

Sealey builds the School Improvement Plan with a group of teacher leaders. Data is disaggregated, reviewed, and priorities set for the upcoming school year. Once a plan is created, it is presented to our School Advisory Council (SAC) for review and approval.

Throughout the course of the year, student progress and school efforts are reported to SAC. At this time,

community members and parents are able to ask questions, provide feedback, and discuss possible decisions for improvement.

The SIP is posted to the school's website at the following address:https://www.leonschools.net/domain/5322

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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, strings and chorus performances, and Family Literacy Nights.

The PFEP plan is posted to the school's website at the following address: https://www.leonschools.net/domain/5708

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

Sealey will utilize a planned block of instruction that will specifically target student needs. This block of time is structured based on providing an opportunity to remediate, review, and enrich to strengthen the learning opportunities within the classroom. Student groups are developed based on progress monitoring and state-wide assessment data, which adjust based upon student growth. Specific skills are targeted or extended based on data collected.

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

N/A