

Escambia County School District

Beulah Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 21 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 25 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 27 |

Beulah Elementary School

6201 HELMS RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

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 Beulah Elementary School is to provide every opportunity for each child to learn and develop academically, physically, creatively and emotionally.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Beulah Elementary, we believe that the school is primarily for children. Our aim shall be to enhance the learning and development of the individual student in all phases of academic, physical, creative and emotional endeavors by providing a positive classroom climate. Our function is to provide opportunities for choices and decisions while promoting independent thinking using all available resources, materials, and training. Our goal is to hear students say "I can do it!" We believe that through a cooperative effort between the home, school, and community we can reach our goal. Our mission at Beulah Elementary School is to provide every opportunity for each child to learn and develop academically, physically, creatively and emotionally.

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 |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Sillers, Monica | Principal | <p>The leadership team will meet as needed to address problem solving and response to intervention. Members will report back to their respective groups to relay strategies and implementation methods. The admin team will provide a common vision for the use of databased decision making , ensure that the school based team is implementing RTI, and parents are being informed of student progress.</p> |
| Mott, Angela | Assistant Principal | <p>The leadership team will meet as needed to address problem solving and response to intervention. Members will report back to their respective groups to relay strategies and implementation methods. The admin team will provide a common vision for the use of databased decision making , ensure that the school based team is implementing RTI, and parents are being informed of student progress.</p> |
| Mefford, Carolyn | Curriculum Resource Teacher | <p>The leadership team will meet as needed to address problem solving and response to intervention. Members will report back to their respective groups to relay strategies and implementation methods. The admin team will provide a common vision for the use of databased decision making , ensure that the school based team is implementing RTI, and parents are being informed of student progress.</p> |
| Beck, Leigh Ann | Teacher, K-12 | <p>The leadership team will meet as needed to address problem solving and response to intervention. Members will report back to their respective groups to relay strategies and implementation methods. The admin team will provide a common vision for the use of databased decision making , ensure that the school based team is implementing RTI, and parents are being informed of student progress.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|----------------|---|
| Palmer, Kristen | Teacher, K-12 | <p>The leadership team will meet as needed to address problem solving and response to intervention. Members will report back to their respective groups to relay strategies and implementation methods. The admin team will provide a common vision for the use of databased decision making , ensure that the school based team is implementing RTI, and parents are being informed of student progress.</p> |
| Merritt, Tammy | Teacher, K-12 | <p>The leadership team will meet as needed to address problem solving and response to intervention. Members will report back to their respective groups to relay strategies and implementation methods. The admin team will provide a common vision for the use of databased decision making , ensure that the school based team is implementing RTI, and parents are being informed of student progress.</p> |
| Paynter, Brandy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Aiken, Kimberly | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Coates, Kristen | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Ferrara, Brooke | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Gibson, Jeremy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Freauff, Miranda | Teacher, K-12 | |
| goodman, Sheryl | Teacher, ESE | |
| Livingston, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Moore, Johanna | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Price, Melissa | Other | |
| Sharp, Dana | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Roughton, Sherry | Other | |

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.

All stakeholders can provide input through surveys.

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 meet to review data and adjustments as needed.

| 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 KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 40% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 59% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 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 | 11 | 50 | 39 | 33 | 32 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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 | 12 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | 18 | 38 | 34 | 47 | 49 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 14 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 18 | 38 | 34 | 47 | 49 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 14 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 48 | 53 | 61 | 51 | 56 | 58 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55 | | | 39 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46 | | | 41 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 51 | 50 | 59 | 57 | 46 | 50 | 53 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 55 | | | 39 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44 | | | 34 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 55 | 52 | 54 | 64 | 52 | 59 | 55 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 55 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 62 | 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 203 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 382 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 25 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 84 | | | |
| BLK | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| HSP | 46 | | | |
| MUL | 62 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |

| 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 | 44 | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 85 | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |
| MUL | 57 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | | | |
| FRL | 54 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 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 | | | 51 | | | 55 | | | | | |
| SWD | 26 | | | 22 | | | 21 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 78 | | | 89 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 28 | | | 28 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 50 | | | 52 | | | 61 | | | | 4 | |
| MUL | 67 | | | 56 | | | 54 | | | | 4 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | | | 54 | | | 65 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 38 | | | 38 | | | 42 | | | | 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 | 61 | 55 | 46 | 57 | 55 | 44 | 64 | | | | | |
| SWD | 40 | 50 | 35 | 49 | 52 | 55 | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | 88 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 48 | 50 | 37 | 52 | 48 | 54 | | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 79 | | 56 | 63 | | 60 | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 53 | | 59 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 53 | 43 | 61 | 54 | 39 | 71 | | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 57 | 49 | 50 | 52 | 46 | 67 | | | | | |

| 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 | 58 | 39 | 41 | 53 | 39 | 34 | 55 | | | | | |
| SWD | 27 | 27 | 30 | 35 | 25 | 17 | 21 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | 75 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 28 | 31 | 39 | 36 | 20 | 32 | | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | | | 49 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 55 | 42 | | 61 | 58 | | 75 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 41 | 45 | 56 | 37 | 38 | 59 | | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 30 | 39 | 42 | 35 | 31 | 38 | | | | | |

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 | 52% | 49% | 3% | 54% | -2% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 57% | 4% | 58% | 3% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 44% | 3% | 50% | -3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 51% | 3% | 59% | -5% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 58% | 7% | 61% | 4% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 47% | -1% | 55% | -9% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 51% | 5% | 51% | 5% |

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.

The SWD and black sub-group scored below 41% for proficiency in ELA, math & science. These subgroups are also below 41% for ESSA Fast and BEST. The SWD sub-group proficiency scores were 21.2% for ELA, 19.7% for math, 23.5 % for science. The black sub-group proficiency scores were 37% for ELA, 30.9% in math and 27.8% in science. The combined ESSA rating for the SWD subgroup was 21.5% and the black sub-group rating was 31.9%. Last school year our teachers were implementing new standards. Our teachers were also in their 2nd year of implementing a new reading curriculum. Our ESE department consists of 5 teachers and 3 of those teachers were new to our school.

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

In ELL and math, our SWD subgroup showed the greatest decline. In ELA, SWD dropped 17.6% and in math, SWD dropped 28.3%. In science the black and economically disadvantaged sub-groups showed the greatest decline. The black sub-group dropped 26.1% and the economically disadvantaged sub-group dropped 25.1%. Last school year our teachers were implementing new standards. Our teachers were also in their 2nd year of implementing a new reading curriculum. Our ESE department consists of 5 teachers and 3 of those teachers were new to our school.

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.

Our greatest gap when compared to the state average for proficiency was in math with a -3.8% deficit compared to the state. Specifically our 5th grade math showed a -9.8% deficit compared to the state. Our 5th grade had a high population of students with disabilities.

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

Our 4th grade students scored 5% above the state and district average in ELA. In math, our 4th grade students scored 6% above the district's average and 3.6% above the state's average. Our 5th grade students scored 4.4% above the state and district average in science.

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

The data shows that number of student tardiness and absences are an area of concern.

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

SWD proficiency in ELA & math, black students proficiency in ELA & math and 5th grade math & science proficiency.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

Last year we had 30% of our students with 5 or more absences. 33% of kindergartners, 36% of 1st graders, 28% of 2nd graders, 19% of 3rd graders, 31% of 4th graders and 23% of 5th graders were absent 5 days or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

No more than 25% of our students will be absent 5 or more days. Each grade level will have less than 25% of their students with 5 or more absences.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will make contact with parent/guardians after a student has 3 absences.

FOCUS attendance reports will be monitored monthly by administration.

Students who are trending towards chronic absenteeism will be assigned a staff member for "Connect and Check".

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Mott (amott@ecsdfi.us)

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.)

We will use a multi-tiered system for making contact with parents/guardians concerning student absences. After a student misses 3 days the teacher will contact parent/guardian. If the student misses 5 days a member of the administration will contact parent/guardian. If the student misses more than 5 days, the student will be assigned a monitor. The monitor will be a member of our faculty or staff. The role of the monitor will be to create a positive connection between the student, the school and home that enhances the students' engagement with school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools students who have ongoing relationships with adults feel a greater sense of school membership, attachment, and involvement. Wehlage (1989); Wehlage et al. (1989)

Additional benefits of adult-student relationships include reduced risky behaviors, reduced absentee rates, improved grades, and improved communication and social skills. Pringle et al. (1993); Cragar (1994); Sipe (1996); McPartland and Nettles (1991); Grossman and Garry (1997).

The adult advocate helps students overcome these barriers by assisting the student in addressing academic, personal, and emotional needs. The advocate can model positive and respectful behavior and offer guidance, stability, and assistance in making intelligent choices.

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.

Data - Teachers, administration and students will keep track of attendance data and set goals for improved attendance.

The administration will monitor FOCUS attendance reports and meet with teachers to discuss students with 5 or more absences. The team will decide if the student should be assigned a monitor. Together, the monitor and student will set goals for improved school attendance and choose incentives that are motivating to the student.

Person Responsible: Angela Mott (amott@ecsdfi.us)

By When: FOCUS attendance reports will be monitored biweekly.

Professional development - Teachers will view Title 1 student and parent engagement videos.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Mefford (cmefford@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Teachers will view the videos within the first 10 days of school.

Communication - An attendance data collection sheet will be used to record parent/guardian contacts by the teacher and administrator. If the student's absences were not excusable absences and it is deemed by the team that the student is trending towards chronic absenteeism, the student will be assigned a faculty or staff member as a monitor for "connect and check". A child study attendance meeting will also be scheduled to communicate the plan with the parent/guardian.

Person Responsible: Angela Mott (amott@ecsdfi.us)

By When: We will begin monitoring student attendance after the 1st month of school and continue monitoring FOCUS attendance data biweekly throughout the school year.

Incentives/Motivation - Once the student has been assigned a monitor for "Connect and Check" the monitor will work with the student to create a list of possible incentives based on the student's interest. Our PTA will help provide incentives.

Person Responsible: Angela Mott (amott@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Incentives will be provided after student and monitor set a goal and the goal is met. The timeframe for meeting the goal will be determined on an individual basis based on the need and/or age of the student.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**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.

Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency for our students with disabilities in the last 3 years and showed a 17.6% decline based on the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessment. The students with disabilities subgroup dropped from 38.8% proficient for ELA in 2021-2022 to 21.2% proficient in 2022-2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The students with disabilities subgroup dropped from 38.8% proficient for ELA in 2021-2022 to 21.2% proficient in 2022-2023.

Students with disabilities will increase to 25% proficient in ELA.

*Proficiency levels indicated for 2023 are based on levels set as of July 2023.

Monitoring:

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the progress of our students with disabilities in ELA will be FAST progress monitoring, STAR 360, iReady and Schoolnet assessment data. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of instructional practices. The leadership team will also review school wide data monthly. The team will meet with the ESE and general education teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Silvers (msilvers@ecsdfi.us)

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.)

1. Intensify interventions for students by maximizing human resources through scheduling and training.
2. Strengthen Tier 1 instructional delivery through the use of the ELA frameworks and the Florida Practice Profiles.
3. Increase teacher knowledge of scaffolding and differentiation strategies to support students with disabilities and students who strive by providing professional development on reading interventions for substantial reading difficulties.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need assistance in knowing which comprehension strategies to use when struggling with difficult text. Students need explicit instruction in comprehension strategies, vocabulary, decoding, and need repeated readings and increased time spent reading to improve fluency.

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.

Data

Data will be monitored by ESE/GEN Ed teachers and reviewed by administration. Teachers will conduct data chats with students. Administration will meet with ESE/GEN Ed teachers monthly to discuss data and student progress.

Person Responsible: Angela Mott (amott@ecsdfl.us)

By When: We will begin meeting in September and continue to meet monthly throughout the school year.

Professional Development

Teachers will receive professional development on Sound Sensible, Souday System, Heggerty, Read Naturally, and 95% chip kits and multisyllabic routine kits.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Mefford (cmefford@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Professional development will begin in September and continue throughout the school year.

Planning/PLC

Use a common planning protocol school-wide which includes coming prepared to planning, a focus on the benchmarks, and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Angela Mott (amott@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Teachers will begin common planning at the start of the school year.

Coaching/Teacher Support

Provide coaching and frequent feedback to teachers with need as determined by data.

Person Responsible: Monica Silvers (msilvers@ecsdfl.us)

By When: We will begin with our PM1 data and continue throughout the school year as data is collected and reviewed.

Classroom walks/Feedback

Monitor the implementation of interventions through Rti meetings and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Angela Mott (amott@ecsdfl.us)

By When: We will begin with our PM1 data and continue throughout the school year as data is collected and reviewed.

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).

Funding allocations for Title I funds are based on survey 3 poverty data. Schools receive these allocations in the spring and work with Title I and the level directors to determine how those funds are utilized. Title I schools also receive additional funding for low income students to support parent involvement. UniSIG allocations are based on school grade and overall Federal Index rates and are received in late summer. The schools work with the School Transformation Office (STO) and level directors to determine the usage of these funds to maximize impact on student achievement. Both Title I and UniSIG are aligned so there are no resource duplications between these two main school improvement funding sources. The Human Resource Department works with Budgeting, Finance, Title I, STO, and Executive staff to review staffing to ensure schools in need

have staffing that reflects the need of the school. Title I, UniSIG, Reading Allocation, ESSER, and SAI funding sources are utilized to add supplemental positions to meet the needs of schools and align to state and district goals. School Improvement funding allocations are also utilized to pay staff to attend planning sessions and professional development sessions with the Professional Development Department and STO based on input from BSI and the district. The district identifies resources for coaching and planning support through the level directors, School Transformation Office, Title I, and Professional Development Department. Schools are tiered based on need including school grade, overall federal index, graduation rates, and ESSA subgroup data. Supplemental resources in addition to the district purchased core resources are reviewed based on the school need and approved for purchase utilizing school improvement funding and SAI funding. The district has also begun to utilize Canvas as the LMS to help support resource allocation to include benchmark aligned lessons, professional development, and content training for schools. Additional support that is identified by quarterly meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

31% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

32% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

28% of Second grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Students who score below the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are not considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2022-2023 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Third grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 53% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 38% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 48% on the 2023 FAST.

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

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2023 will increase for grades kindergarten through 2nd grade to 50% on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The ELA proficiency rate will increase for grades third through fifth to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2024 FAST PM3.

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.

To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.

- a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
 - b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom. (See FOCUS report)
 - c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart. (See Amira)
 - d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.
2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Florida Literacy Practice Profiles.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Silvers, Monica, msilvers@ecsdfl.us

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?

Beulah Elementary uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP)

The district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how Into Reading meets Florida’s definition of evidence-based. The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.

In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees. Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school’s administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and Rtl teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

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 use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

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 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-

Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.

Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.

Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.

Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-

District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate use of the literacy practice profiles in the delivery of instruction with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.

Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.

Action Step 3: Assessment

Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.

Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.

Action Step 4: Professional Learning -

We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:

Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees

Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.

Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan

The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading.

Silvers, Monica,
msilvers@ecsdfi.us

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.

The Title I Annual Meeting is held during the first quarter of the school year. All stakeholders (families, teachers, staff, and community members) are invited to attend. During this meeting the following information is shared: School Improvement Plan, Parent & Family Engagement Plan, Title I Budget, Parents' Right to Know (defined by Title I law), and the School-Family Compact.

Throughout the school year, SIP progress is regularly shared and discussed through the School Advisory Council. Regardless of membership status, all stakeholders are invited to attend School Advisory Council meetings.

Links to the school's SIP are posted on the school's homepage as well as the schools Our Title I Family page.
<https://www.escambiaschools.org/beulah> & <https://www.escambiaschools.org/domain/1949>

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))

During the 23-24 school year, parent conferences will be held by all teachers to share the progress of each student. FAST data will be reviewed with families. Two* academic Family Nights are scheduled to build the capacity of families in Language Arts* and Math*. Teachers will share strategies which can be used at home. Teachers send daily* and/or weekly* information home to parents regarding their child's academic and social progress.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is shared with families during the Title I Annual Meeting, posted on our website, and messaged to families through the student information system FOCUS.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is accessible from our school's website.
<https://www.escambiaschools.org/beulah> & <https://www.escambiaschools.org/domain/1949>

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)

Teachers will target SWD's and track data to ensure they are making learning gains and progressing towards proficiency. Teachers will use student data to track progress from FAST, STAR 360, Schoolnet, AR, and iReady throughout the year to ensure that students remain on track. ESE teachers and General Ed teachers will meet to discuss progress and strategies used for improving student learning. ESE teachers will ensure accommodations are in place across all subject areas and not just in ELA and Math. General Ed and ESE teachers will discuss current and future lessons plans in order to include the necessary interventions for the students to succeed. This will allow for bell to bell support of the students, instead of only when the ESE teacher is present.

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

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning | \$0.00 |

| | |
|---------------|---------------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|---------------|---------------|

Budget Approval

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

Yes