Niblack Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Niblack Elementary School

837 NE BROADWAY AVE, Lake City, FL 32055

http://nes.columbiak12.com/

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.

Our mission at Niblack Elementary School is to provide a safe learning experience that will allow our students to excel in all areas of life. We aim for an atmosphere of cooperation, with respect for individual differences that is conducive to success. We strive for active engagement from our parents, teachers, staff, and community members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Niblack Elementary School's vision incorporates the collaborative efforts of staff and stakeholders to support learning for all students within our community by encouraging achievement, development, involvement, and teamwork.

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
Murphy, Makeba	Principal	She is responsible for financial operations, building maintenance, student scheduling, personnel, public relations, school policy regarding discipline, coordination of the instructional program and other overall school matters.
Palmer, Glenn	Behavior Specialist	He provides intervention and instruction to assist at-risk students to develop appropriate behavior, coping skills and social skills. He plans and uses appropriate learning skills, activities, and materials that meet the needs of the students.
James, Nancy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	She is responsible for providing curriculum support systems for students, teachers, and parents. Assist the classroom teacher and provide additional support for students with moderate learning difficulties.
Symonette, Violet	Instructional Coach	She is responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.
Bicknell, Terri	School Counselor	She is responsible for offering counseling to students or teachers, conducting group counseling sessions to help students develop their personal and academic skills and providing career advice and guidance to 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and equity; therefore, teachers and staff members will review the SIP draft and provide input during the week of pre-planning. In August, the School Advisory Committee (SAC) will review and provide input also. The SAC committee includes administration, teachers, parents, community members and business partners.

The input provided by the stakeholders will be used to design SIP goals, objectives, the implementation, and accountability of the plan.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Encourage parents and community stakeholders to be involved on the SAC Committee. The SAC Committee will review SIP objectives, implementation, and outcomes at each of its meetings. At the Mid Year SIP review we will use this time to review the plan and make adjustments as necessary based on data. Part of the lead team meets with teachers weekly to discuss and review data relating to the SIP.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
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	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C

	2018-19: C
	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	27	12	15	8	11	8	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	4	2	7	5	9	4	0	0	0	31
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	13	17	7	6	7	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	8	12	6	4	6	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	5	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	9	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	4	6	13	10	7	0	0	0	52
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	6	10	14	10	14	12	0	0	0	66

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	14	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	7

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	15	16	24	6	13	9	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	2	2	5	2	3	3	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	4	10	3	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	2	9	5	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	4	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	10	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	8	5	13	8	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	8

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	15	16	24	6	13	9	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	2	2	5	2	3	3	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	4	10	3	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	2	9	5	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	4	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	10	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	8	5	13	8	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	8

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	2023			2022			2021		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement*	49	52	53	50	58	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				62			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			50		
Math Achievement*	60	63	59	54	55	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				67			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64					
Science Achievement*	30	49	54	31	67	59	14		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					55	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		57	59						

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	189
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 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	31	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				

2022-23 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%
WHT				
FRL	47			

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	55			

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)

2022-23 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	49			60			30					
SWD	28			34							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			58			24				4	
HSP												

2022-23 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	47			62			30				4	

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	50	62	64	54	67	64	31					
SWD	32	37		30	41		7					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	65	62	53	69	64	32					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	46	61	62	53	67	64	33					

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	42	52	50	49	58		14					
SWD	9	33		26	50		14					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	54		51	60		16					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

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
FRL	36	41	50	46	56		10					

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	46%	57%	-11%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	80%	72%	8%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	66%	-3%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	60%	-14%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	21%	50%	-29%	51%	-30%

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.

In 2023, the fifth grade Science was the lowest area of achievement. The Science achievement level was 21 percent, the District average was 50 percent and the State average was 51 percent. A few contributing factors include limited background knowledge and low percentage of students scoring on grade level in ELA. Additionally, a mid-year change in staffing caused our Science Lab to not be utilized, limiting the opportunity for experiments for students. A noted trend is the Nature of Science strand has been the lowest area for the past three years.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from 2022 to 2023. In 2023 Science was 21 percent proficiency and in 2022 science was 31 percent proficiency, this is a decrease of 10%. A few contributing factors include limited background knowledge and low percentage of students scoring on grade level in ELA. Additionally, a mid-year change in staffing caused our Science Lab to not be utilized, limiting the opportunity for experiments for students. A noted trend is the Nature of Science strand has been the lowest area for the past three years.

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.

Science has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. In 2023 the state average in science was 51 percent proficiency and Niblack was 21 percent proficiency. This is a gap of 30 percentage points from the state average. A few contributing factors include limited background knowledge and low percentage of students scoring on grade level in ELA. Additionally, a mid-year change in staffing caused our Science Lab to not be utilized, limiting the opportunity for experiments for students. A noted trend is the Nature of Science strand has been the lowest area for the past three years.

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

Math showed the most improvement. In 2023 math proficiency was 63 percent and in 2022 it was 54 percent proficiency. This was an increase of 9 percentage points. Contributing factors to this improvement includes spiral review of standards throughout the school year. Analysis of the data to specific students needs and plan accordingly. Classroom teachers provided grade level standard based instruction. Lead team assisting with intervention groups based on standards.

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

Reflecting on the early warning data, an area of concern is attendance/truancy. The number of students absent 10% or more days was the highest. Another area of concern is the area of ELA including the numbers of students showing course failure in ELA and students with a substantial deficiency in reading.

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

Attendance
Students with Disabilities
Science
ELA

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

With low proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science, the school will focus on these subjects. A review of the 2023 FAST scores highlighted the need to focus on ELA, Math and Science. The proficiency for the ELA and Math was 46% and 63% percent, while the Science score decreased by 10 percent, which was below the state average. Consequently, this is a focus area for the school as well.

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

If all teachers provide high quality rigorous instruction aligned with subject area standards, then student achievement will increase by 3% in ELA, Math and Science. Employing differentiated instruction through direct, small group, and web based software instruction, teachers will utilize supplemental educational materials and supplies.

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

In addition to diagnostic and formative assessments given during the instructional process, the FAST assessments, which are done three times during the school year, will also be used to monitor and evaluate student progress and instructional needs. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs in order to monitor instruction. Lesson plans will be monitored on a weekly basis by administration. Members of the leadership team will meet with teachers and provide time to analyze data and evaluate instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Violet Symonette (symonettev@columbiak12.com)

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.)

Evidence-based strategies being implemented for Standards-aligned instruction include: Metacognitive strategies that clarify purpose for reading, preview text, monitor reading, adjust reading rate, and checks for understanding. Visual thinking tools such as Graphic organizers and semantic maps or cognitive stimulation techniques such as questions and summarizing, and unravel are additional evidence-based strategies employed to strengthen learning. iReady, an ELA software based program, will also be used (strong).

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

The evidence-based strategies listed above are recommended strategies through the Florida Reading Initiative. These strategies have been proven to increase reading achievement here at Niblack in previous years. The resources used to implement these strategies are: Core Curriculum (Wonders and Savvas) - promising, Study Island (ELA, Math, and Science) - moderate, iReady ELA - moderate, Read Naturally - moderate, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, iReady Teacher Toolbox - strong, Savvas Math Intervention - promising, and iReady Math (MTSS students) - strong.

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.

Implement individualized instruction for each student through Accelerated Reader, iReady ELA, eSparks, and Study Island.

Person Responsible: Violet Symonette (symonettev@columbiak12.com)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Teachers will utilize supplemental materials, Magnetic Reading, Florida Ready Best Math, Focus on Reading, Focus on Math, Best Math Everglades Publishing and Simple Solutions Science to meet students' individual needs.

Person Responsible: Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Students will receive differentiated instruction from teachers, paraprofessionals, and tutors to work in small groups with students on targeted benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Violet Symonette (symonettev@columbiak12.com)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#2. 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 Percent of Points Index, students with disabilities scored below 32% in areas of ELA, Math, and Science on the 2021 - 2022 State Test. The Federal Percent of Points earned for the 2021 - 2022 school year was 29%.

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

Students with disabilities in grades 3 - 5 will improve student achievement in the areas of ELA, Math and Science by 3%.

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

Analyzing data and evaluating instructional practices with classroom teachers at weekly Common Planning Meetings. Analyzing data during Collaborative Planning Days will allow the teachers the opportunity for more in depth monitoring of data and instruction. The administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs in order to monitor instruction. The administration will also evaluate lesson plans on a weekly basis. Progress monitoring assessments will be scheduled to monitor progress and drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Makeba Murphy (murphym@columbiak12.com)

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.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented to achieve this goal is small group instruction (Hattie, 2012). Using ESSA evidence-based programs such as Study Island (moderate), Read Naturally (moderate), i-Ready (moderate), Wonders and Savvas Intervention (promising) and Simple Solutions Science. We will also use paraprofessionals and/or tutors to help improve student achievement in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science.

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

The evidence-based strategies listed above will help improve student achievement in the areas of ELA, Math and Science. The following researched based resources will be used to help implement this strategy: Study Island for ELA and Math (moderate), Read Naturally for ELA (moderate), iReady Teacher Toolkit for ELA and Math (strong), iReady ELA lessons (strong), Wonders Intervention for ELA (promising), Savvas Re-Teach for Math (promising), & Simple Solutions Science.

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.

Small group instruction (Hattie, 2012) will be implemented through the use of ESE inclusion teachers, paraprofessionals, and/or tutors.

Person Responsible: Makeba Murphy (murphym@columbiak12.com)

By When: This action step will occur throughout the school year.

Leadership team and ESE staffing specialists will meet with the ESE teachers and classroom teachers to ensure IEP goals are monitored and accommodations are provided with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Terri Bicknell (bicknellt@columbiak12.com)

By When: This action step will occur throughout the school year.

The instructional coach will provide professional development for all teachers in the areas of ELA and Math to help with academic achievement.

Person Responsible: Violet Symonette (symonettev@columbiak12.com)

By When: This action step will occur throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After analyzing the 2022 - 2023 parent involvement activities, the results showed limited parent involvement. Studies have shown that students who have a positive support system achieve better.

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

If we increase family engagement at Niblack through providing opportunities for active engagement, then students' achievement will increase by 3% and discipline referrals will decrease by 3%.

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

Monitoring will be done through parent participation through sign in sheets and FOCUS discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Glenn Palmer (palmerg@columbiak12.com)

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.)

The evidence-based strategies being implemented for this area of focus are: frequent and positive communication with parents, creating a welcoming environment, developing relationships with parents, and survey parents for interest in events being offered.

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

Research has shown that if parents are involved, students will be more successful. These strategies have been utilized in previous years here at Niblack. In the past, we have seen a positive correlation with parent involvement and students academic achievement.

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.

Curriculum nights (ELA, Math, Science) - We will provide families with grade appropriate information in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science. Students and parents will have the opportunity to visit stations and engage in hands-on activities. Parents will receive innovative ways to make learning enjoyable.

Person Responsible: Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)

By When: At the end of each curriculum night.

We will provide families and community members with information about initiatives to improve student achievement. We also allow them the opportunity to give input.

Person Responsible: Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)

By When: Throughout the school year (minimum of 4 meetings)

Parent/family conferences - We will provide families the opportunity to meet their child's teacher and ask about their progress and receive strategies for home practice.

Person Responsible: Glenn Palmer (palmerg@columbiak12.com)

By When: Throughout the school year

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).

Data days and regularly scheduled SAC meetings, will be conducted to review the schools data. Analysis of the data will give the direction of the schools needs. From this data the funding allocations will be budgeted according to the schools needs.

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

After analyzing the FAST data, the percentage of students who are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessments are as follows: Kindergarten 45 percent, first grade 48 percent, and second grade 29 percent. As a result of this data ELA has been identified as a need for an area of focus for students in grades K - 2. We will implement grade level interventions. The grade level will be divided into 3 groups based on the school data. There will be a high, medium and below medium group. The students will receive ELA interventions based on their data.

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

After analyzing the FAST data, the percentage of students who are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessments are as follows: third grade 52 percent, fourth grade 56 percent, and fifth grade 55 percent. As a result of this data ELA has been identified as a critical

need for an area of focus for students in grades 3 - 5. We will implement grade level interventions. We will implement grade level interventions. The grade level will be divided into 3 groups based on the school data. There will be a high, medium, and below medium group. The students will receive ELA interventions based on their data.

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

If all teachers, in grades K - 2, provide high quality rigorous instruction aligned with subject area standards, through differentiated instruction by implementing technology through the web based software and supplemental educational materials and supplies, then student achievement will increase where 50 percent or more students will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If all teachers, in grades 3 - 5, provide high quality rigorous instruction aligned with subject area standards, through differentiated instruction by implementing technology through the web based software and supplemental educational materials and supplies, then student achievement will increase where 50 percent or more students will be on track to pass the statewide 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.

Monitoring will be done through progress monitor assessments given throughout the year (3 times a year). After each progress monitoring assessment there will be a common plan or data day where teachers and the lead team will analyze the data and make adjustments as needed to the interventions.

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

Murphy, Makeba, murphym@columbiak12.com

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?

Evidence-based strategies being implemented for this area of focus are: Metacognitive strategies that clarify purpose for reading, preview text, monitor reading, adjust reading rate, and check understanding, graphic organizers and semantic maps, questions and summarizing, and unravel.

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?

The evidence-based strategies listed are recommended strategies through the Florida Reading Initiative. These strategies have been proven to increase reading achievement at Niblack in 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
Assessment - Teacher will create a benchmark focus calendar. On this calendar will be the benchmark focus for the week and the date of the assessment on that benchmark. Teachers will record the scores of the assessment. Based on the results, the teacher will create groups that need enrichment, reteaching, and maintaining. Students who need reteaching will be assessed again on the same benchmark.	Symonette, Violet, symonettev@columbiak12.com
Literacy Coaching - During common planning members of the lead team will assist teachers creating intervention groups and gathering resources for the groups. This will offer ongoing support for teachers with the process of implementing intervention groups.	Symonette, Violet, symonettev@columbiak12.com

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.

Information about the SIP/SWP is disseminated in the following ways: 1) During the Annual Title I meeting held at the beginning of the school year (September), the SIP/SWP is incorporated. Copies of the plan are available at these meetings and through other sources which include the school and district website. A notice is sent home to parents informing that the SIP/SWP is located on the websites and that they may request a copy of the plan and who to request if from; 2) The school will distribute information concerning the SIP/SWP at parent meetings (PTO, School Advisory Council meetings) and through newsletter and flyers sent home throughout the year; 3) Reports are translated into Spanish and/or other languages, as needed.

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))

In order to build positive relationships with families and other stakeholders, Niblack will provide various opportunities for families to become engaged in the academic success of students. Families will be given the opportunity to meet classroom teachers, staff and administration at Meet the Teacher prior to the first day of school. Classroom teacher will also make positive contact with each parent within the first two weeks of school. Also within the first nine weeks of school, Niblack hosts Open House in which families are invited in to learn more about the expectations for each grade level. Classroom teachers will have a parent conference after each progress monitoring assessment to inform parents of their child's progress.

Throughout the school year staff and families will actively engage in activities such as Science Night, Math Night, Cold Read Nights, All Pro Dads Program and Muffin for Moms. Parents, families and community stakeholders will be encouraged to be involved with the school's SAC and PTO.

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))

In order to strengthen the academic program at Niblack and increase the amount and quality of learning time, teachers will provide quality rigorous instruction aligned with subject area standards. We will also use C-Tag tutors to intervene with bubble students in the area of reading. Small group instruction will be implemented through the use of ESE inclusion teachers and paraprofessionals.

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))

The development of this plan is coordinated with other programs funded under ESSA, as follows:

1. Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A and Title V funds collaborate to provide professional development opportunities to assist teachers in Title I schools in developing skills needed to work with students to improve academic achievement among all subgroups.

2. Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, Title V, Part B and state funds collaborate to provide instructional coaches that provide embedded professional development, intensive coaching cycle, modeling of best practices and instructional resources to teachers.

3. Title I and Title IX collaborate to provide needed services and materials for homeless students;

4. Title I and ESE collaborate to avoid duplication of services provided by Title I and IDEA, as well as to maximize resources.

5. Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A collaborate with professional development.

6. Title V and Title I collaborate with technology/software purchases.

7. State and Local funds are used to support the instructional program in all core content areas.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Students that experience personal, mental or academic challenges are afforded the opportunity to receive services from the school's guidance counselor. Counseling services are available for individual, group or whole class. Niblack also has a licensed mental health counselor present on campus two days per week. All classes receive lessons in child safety from the mental health counselor. Also, the mental health counselor provides targeted groups of students with small group counseling depending on the

area of need. Additionally, students in the 21st Century after school program receive lessons from the Stafford Harmony curriculum.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Not Applicable

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Niblack Elementary uses the restorative practices program to model, prevent and address problem behavior. Restorative practices provide students and caring adults with an intentional, inclusive, and respectful way of thinking about, talking about, and responding to behavioral issues. When integrated in a school community, restorative practices help to build and repair relationships, prioritize student agency, and de-emphasize punitive discipline in favor of communication to resolve conflict. We also use the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) program. Students are recognized for meeting behavior expectations from anywhere in the school, not just the classrooms.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The school provides professional learning for instructional and administrative leaders to support adult learning. The use of Instructional Coaches to provide job-embedded professional learning to all paraprofessionals, other school personnel, and teachers regardless of where each teacher's skill level resides on the mastery spectrum. The Professional Learning activities provide consistency and understanding of instructional methodology, high-impact instructional strategies, data analysis of student performance assessment outcomes, and other professional learning activities that are focused on the learning needs of students that are unique to the school. The school will recruit and retain effective teachers through support and collaboration. Support through mentoring programs and support and collaboration from the instructional coach will assist with teacher retention.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The school provides a Kindergarten Orientation Night/Kindergarten Roundup in June where parents have an opportunity to get to know the school, meet school-based administrators, and teachers as well as receive supply lists and receive information about Kindergarten, register for Kindergarten, Child Find is employed and in some situations, vision and hearing screenings occur. Parents receive materials and supplies to work with their children over the summer to help prepare them for the rigors of Kindergarten and to prevent "Summer Slide". Translators will be provided as feasible. The LEA provides a modified schedule for Kindergarten students during the first week of school. In the first two days of school, the students only attend for a half-day to help the child transition into a full day of formalized education. Prior to the first day of school, the teachers conduct one on one conferences with each parent and child in order for the teacher to discuss academic standards expectations and gather information about the student. During the meeting, the parent is provided ample opportunities to ask questions to help the child acclimate to the new learning environment. This type of meeting and student sche

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$10,583.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	369	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$7,885.00
		Notes: iReady - Online program				
	5100	369	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,698.00
		Notes: eSpark - Online program				
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$2,695.05**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,695.05
		Notes: Supplemental Materials - Evergaldes Publishing				
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other**				**$950.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6150	510	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$150.00
		Notes: ELA Curriclum Night				
	6150	510	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$200.00
		Notes: Math Curriculum Night				
	6150	510	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$300.00
		Notes: Science Curriculum Night				
	6150	510	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$300.00
		Notes: All Pro Dads program				
					Total:	**$14,228.05**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No