Beulah Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Beulah Middle School

6001 W NINE MILE 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.

At Beulah, we believe that all students can learn and be successful. We aim to create an environment that will prepare students for careers and college. The faculty is committed to providing engaging, rigorous academic courses to challenge students to prepare them to excel in high school, college, and the workforce.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to be a safe, caring, nurturing environment where all students can feel emotionally, intellectually, and physically supported. Encourage critical thinking, integrity, self-confidence, and desire for excellence. Achieve academic excellence by embracing technology and encouraging students to try new things in order for them to reach their highest potential. Recognize that each student is unique. Build positive personal characteristics such as tolerance, cooperation, honesty, and encourage respect for the individual differences that make each of us unique. Support creativity, individuality innovative thinking; in order to prepare students to become leaders who can meet the challenges of our world both today and tomorrow.

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, Frank	Principal	
Gentry, Brandi	Assistant Principal	
Madison, Julie	School Counselor	
Quinn, Brian	Behavior Specialist	
Lavaway, Jason	Dean	
Payne, Stephanie	Teacher, ESE	

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 are selected to participate in the Leadership Team using various techniques. The principal and assistant principal are assigned based on their role in the school. Teachers are selected from the Department Leaders whose colleagues vote at the start of each year. In addition, the Dean of Students and Behavior Coach are appointed positions on the team by the principal. Parents serving on the team

are nominated and voted on by their peers within the school community and serve on the School Advisory Council.

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))

Monthly monitoring will occur at Leadership Meetings, School Advisory Meetings, and during our Professional Learning Community meetings.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	89%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	82	104	274
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	119	112	271
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	30	20	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	35	36	86
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	111	119	329
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	102	102	330
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	65	69	191

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	83	73	185

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	5	19

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	80	87	249
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	84	59	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	17	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	24	5	47
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	93	235
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	128	93	312
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	0	0	0	0	0	65	95	77	237

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	80	87	249
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	84	59	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	17	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	24	5	47
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	93	235
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	128	93	312
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	0	0	0	0	0	65	95	77	237

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	37	40	49	40	42	50	45		
ELA Learning Gains				41			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			30		
Math Achievement*	33	45	56	41	33	36	38		
Math Learning Gains				50			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			24		
Science Achievement*	46	40	49	49	43	53	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	59	68	69	50	58	71		
Middle School Acceleration	74	73	73	76	47	49	78		
Graduation Rate					41	49			
College and Career Acceleration					57	70			
ELP Progress		39	40		79	76			

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	258
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	59			
BLK	42			
HSP	49			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	46			

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	32	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	54			
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	51			

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%
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	43			

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	37			33			46	68	74			
SWD	13			9			17	53	33		5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	61			56							2	
BLK	23			20			27	61	78		5	
HSP	39			30			41	62	74		5	
MUL	42			40			58	72	63		5	
PAC												
WHT	47			42			57	73	74		5	
FRL	32			27			40	60	73		5	

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	40	41	32	41	50	40	49	69	76			
SWD	17	35	29	18	40	36	20	43	47			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	63	38		60	53							

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
BLK	29	37	28	20	37	34	29	54	72			
HSP	40	33	50	41	60	42	44	74	72			
MUL	44	43		48	46		55	80	77			
PAC												
WHT	48	44	38	56	59	51	62	77	77			
FRL	34	39	29	32	43	41	40	58	70			

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	45	43	30	38	31	24	40	71	78			
SWD	22	29	20	21	29	22	23	38	67			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	81	67		69	42							
BLK	29	34	25	21	23	19	26	57	76			
HSP	56	54		42	25		30	82	92			
MUL	55	59	45	46	44	36	53	82	76			
PAC												
WHT	52	46	32	49	35	27	50	77	77			
FRL	34	37	26	32	29	23	29	63	83			

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
07	2023 - Spring	36%	37%	-1%	47%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	38%	-2%	47%	-11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	37%	-4%	47%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	29%	41%	-12%	54%	-25%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	48%	-9%	48%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	22%	31%	-9%	55%	-33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	36%	12%	44%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	38%	41%	50%	29%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	66%	-1%

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.

Students with disabilities and black students were the two lowest cohorts of students. The SWD cohort has a 21-22 Federal Index of 32 and African American cohort has a 21-22 Federal Index of 38. Both cohorts have had a federal index below 41% for 2 consecutive years. SWD cohort was 13% proficient and African American cohort was 21% proficient on the 22-23 ELA FAST. Math proficiency for the 22-23 FAST for the SWD cohort was 13% and 22% for the African American cohort. The number of unfilled vacancies and the need for pedagogical skills from new teachers all contributed to the low performance in these two student cohorts. Additionally, there needed to be more training provided and support of instructional resources to support instructional classroom practices. Inclusion support teachers needed to be more effectively staffed in core courses to support the academic needs of SWD effectively.

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

Our black subgroup showed the most significant decline in ELA by dropping 7 points, and our multi-racial subgroup had the most significant decrease in Math by dropping 10 points. For our students, our behavior data reveals our black students had significantly more ODRs than the other subgroups.

No single factor(s) contributed to the decline other than an increase in missed instructional time, attendance, and the lack of instructional practices due to staffing inconsistencies during the 22-23 SY.

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.

The ELA gap between the 2 identified ESSA cohorts, SWD and African Americans, was the greatest from the state. There was a 34 percent gap for SWD students and 26 point gap for African Americans. In math there was a 40 point gap for SWD students and a 31 point gap for African Americans compared to the state.

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

Students in Civics demonstrated a 18 point increase from the previous reporting year. This was as a result of the content being taught with fidelity using evidence based practices to support student growth. Additionally, the instructional staff in Civics remained consistent for the entire 22-23 SY.

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

After analyzing our EWS data, the two areas of concern for the 2023-24 SY are student attendance and behavior. Data shows that during the 22-24 SY that 289 students had below a 90% attendance rate. The eighth-grade cohort was the largest group impacted, with 105 students. Additionally, discipline is another EWS concern. After the 22-23 SY, 290 students across all cohorts had one or more disciplinary referrals. The seventh-grade cohort had the most students in this statistical category, with 129. This cohort will be eighth graders for the 23-24 SY.

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

Behavior, attendance, SWD, and black students

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.

After reviewing the 22-23 SY data, African American and Economically disadvantaged cohorts had the highest percentage of referrals. Economically disadvantaged students comprised 74% of the total disciplinary referrals for quarter 4 in the 22-23 school year. Students in the African American cohort made up 52% of the students with referrals for quarter 4 of the 22-23 school year. Many students who received referrals in the 4th quarter are identified in both cohorts.

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

By implementing our 23-24 PBIS plan and defining expectations in the common areas and classroom, we will see a reduction in the overall percentage of these three cohorts' disciplinary referrals for the 23-24 SY. Additionally, a new focus and theme embedded in our PBIS plan and providing support and modeling to teachers will aid in the percentage decrease. Economically Disadvantaged students receiving referrals in the 23-24 school year will drop by 30 or more percentage points to be 44% or lower. African American students receiving referrals in the 23-24 school year will also drop by 30 or more percentage points to be 32% or lower.

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

The leadership team will embed strategies to improve student discipline through our Professional Development program that will be provided to all stakeholders through our Canvas class Beulah University. Professional Development activities will include scenarios, best practices, observation, data monitoring, and reflective dialogue among faculty and staff groups. Through classroom walk-throughs, observations, and student data analysis, monitoring will be conducted to reach intended outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfl.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. Schools have a multitiered system in place that supports the behavioral practices—from the school wide to the individualized levels (10 Keys to Behavior- Tier 1)
2. Monitor the progress of all students, and proactively intervene when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems. Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools- Tier 2)

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

1. According to 10 Keys to Behavior Practice Guide from The Meadow Center, having a multitiered system in place that supports the behavior practices from the school wide to the individualized levels shows a positive impact on student achievement, behavior, and attendance. (Tier 1)
2. According to Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools, monitoring the progress of all students, and proactively intervening when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems has a positive impact on student achievement, behavior, and attendance. (Tier 2)

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.

We will incorporate strategies through our site-based PBIS program. This program has been proven methodology to improve student behavior through positive interventions. Our PBIS program will have a lead teacher Ena Floyd Johnson, who will work with teachers and students daily to advocate and promote a positive culture for our stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ena Floyd Johson will work daily with teachers and students throughout the 23-24 school year

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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 careful examination of the assessment results for the 22 - 23 SY students identified in the black cohort were 21% proficient in ELA and 22% proficient in Math.

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

Students in the black cohort were 21% proficient in ELA during the 22-23 SY assessment. The cohort will improve by 10 percentage points or more in ELA proficiency on the 23-24 PM3 ELA FAST to achieve a proficiency of 31% or higher. They will also improve by 10 percentage points or more in Math proficiency on the 23-24 PM3 FAST to achieve a proficiency of 32% or higher.

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

The leadership team will work closely with Professional Learning Community and ILT in order to improve future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation, acceleration, and reteaching opportunities. The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be FAST, STAR, district quarterly assessments, and school-based assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide
data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for acceleration, remediation or reteaching opportunities.. Additionally, we will reteach skills where deficits exist and accelerate learning in applicable areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.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. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction within text. (Tier 1)
2. Utilizing writing for a variety of purposes (Tier 2)
3. Students are given multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary in natural contexts through listening, reading, speaking, and writing. (Tier 1)

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

1 According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works Clearing House, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies shows positive impact on student achievement.
2. According to the Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively from What Works Clearing House, utilizing writing for a variety of purposes shows positive impact on student achievement.
3. According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student 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.

Providing explicit vocabulary instruction, intensive writing strategies, and reading skills development in order to help students become proficient in ELA.

Person Responsible: Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year

We will have a school-wide reading program where 15 minutes at day will be allocated for reading support at the same time each day.

Person Responsible: Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year

A robust student reading program will be supported through out Media Center. Implementation of strategies provided by the district ELA specialist, as well as, support provided by our ELA school leader (Dr. Lepinay) will allow for internal professional growth to impact positive student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year

#3. 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.

After careful examination of the assessment results for the 22 - 23 SY students identified in the SWD cohort we 13% proficient in ELA and Math.

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

Students in the SWD cohort were 13% proficient in ELA and Math on the 22-23 FAST assessment. The cohort will improve by 10 percentage points or more in proficiency in both tested areas on the 23-24 PM3 FAST. This would move both tested areas to 23% proficiency or higher.

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

The leadership team will work closely with Professional Learning Community and ILT in order to improve future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation, acceleration, and reteaching opportunities. The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be FAST, STAR, district quarterly assessments, and school-based assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide
data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for acceleration, remediation or reteaching opportunities..
Additionally, we will reteach skills where deficits exist and accelerate learning in applicable areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.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. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction within text. (Tier 1)
2. Utilizing writing for a variety of purposes (Tier 2)
3. Students are given multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary in natural contexts through listening, reading, speaking, and writing. (Tier 1)

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

1 According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works Clearing House, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies shows positive impact on student achievement.
2. According to the Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively from What Works Clearing House, utilizing writing for a variety of purposes shows positive impact on student achievement.
3. According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student 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.

Providing explicit vocabulary instruction, intensive writing strategies, and reading skills development in order to help students become proficient in ELA.

Person Responsible: Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: on-going for the 23-24 school year

A robust student reading program will be supported through out Media Center. Implementation of strategies provided by the district ELA specialist, as well as, support provided by our ELA school leader (Dr. Lepinay)will allow for internal professional growth to impact positive student outcomes

Person Responsible: Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: on-going for the 23-24 school year

We will have a school-wide reading program where 15 minutes at day will be allocated for reading support at the same time each day.

Person Responsible: Frank Murphy (fmurphy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: on-going for the 23-24 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).

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.

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.

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, multiple academic Family Nights are scheduled to build the capacity for involvement and building relationships to improve student academic achievement.

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

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is accessible from our school's website.
https://www.escambiaschools.org/domain/1605

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))

This plan is developed to address the needs of our most struggling students. It is, however, designed to positively impact all students on our campus through a robust Literacy Plan that will be implemented across all curriculums. Through available Title I dollars, teachers will have planning opportunities beyond their designated work hours, a chance to participate in book studies, and allow the student to use remedial and enrichment platforms beyond their regular classroom instruction. Core classrooms are also provided with engaging and purposeful manipulatives to enhance their academic growth

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))

IDEA: Provides students with disabilities a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) that is tailored to their individual needs including an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), appropriate evaluation, parent and teacher participation, and procedural safeguards.

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 are able to requests assistance from counselors through FOCUS. Students participate in the required Mental Health modules. Our Military Family Life counselor meets oversees the counseling needs of our military connected students. We have a contracted mental health counselor that oversees the more significant counseling needs when request are made through the school and parent consent forms are appropriately completed. Finally, we provide counseling services through out guidance counselors to individual students and groups.

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))

We provide opportunities for students to earn high school credit in Computer Fundamentals, Algebra, Geometry, Biology, and Spanish. Additionally, students can earn industry certifications in Computer Fundamentals, Engineering/Robotics, and Agriculture.

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).

We provide behavioral tiered support through several vessels. We announce daily or Beulah Behavioral Expectations, posters with our expectations are provided through the building/website, we utilize our PBIS coach to assist with overall behavioral support for our faculty/staff, and we have a RTI teachers that works with district and school staff to assist developing action plans for students individual needs.

Staff Dedicated to Behavior:
Behavior Coach
PBIS Teacher
RTI Teacher
Dean

RTI meetings and Behavior Team meetings are conducted monthly to review information related to behavioral expectations and instructional practices used to improve them throughout our school.

We make referrals to our school counselor to provide additional support.

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))

During the 2023-24 school year the teachers will participate in professional development focusing on classroom management and data review and implementation. Professional development will be provided through our Canvas portal called "Beulah University". Bi monthly Professional Learning Communities will review data and develop instructional strategies on how to improve student outcomes.

RTI training and De-escalation training is being used and placing teachers in a coaching cycle as determined by classroom walk throughs.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$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.

No