
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Blue Angels Elementary School

1551 DOG TRACK RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

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 Blue Angels Elementary School is to promote joy in learning in a safe, child-centered environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to meet the academic needs of each student at Blue Angels Elementary School while helping to develop well rounded citizens.

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, Jayne	Principal	
Prout, Nancy	Assistant Principal	
Flynn, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Tanton, Lauren	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.

During the yearly Title 1 meeting, the school-wide data and goals will be provided to stakeholders. Stakeholders will be asked for input on the school improvement strategies developed. The leadership team will meet at least quarterly to discuss progress towards goals and will disseminate information to the grade levels during grade level planning meetings. Stakeholders (school and community) will receive information concerning student data on a regular basis.

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))

Student assessment performance of all students in each subgroup will be closely monitored (F.A.S.T and classroom assessments) for movement towards proficiency and/or a learning gain. Students with the greatest achievement gaps will be targeted at data meetings with the teachers and leadership team. At

this time, revisions in intervention strategies and I-Ready paths will be discussed. Attendance and tardies will also be closely monitored. Students and teachers will establish goals prior to each AP and have data chats with students.

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	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	5	36	22	26	22	26	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	6	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	7	5	5	3	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	5	7	4	0	0	0	22
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	3	3	3	8	7	0	0	0	24

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	3	2	4	5	4	0	0	0	18

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	4	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4

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	10	35	23	17	17	17	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	3	0	3	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	6	2	3	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	4	3	3	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	13	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	13	23	0	0	0	43
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	1	3	0	6	9	10	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	10	35	23	17	17	17	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	3	0	3	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	6	2	3	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	4	3	3	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	13	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	13	23	0	0	0	43
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	1	3	0	6	9	10	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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*	53	48	53	68	51	56	64		
ELA Learning Gains				55			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			41		
Math Achievement*	59	50	59	57	46	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				43			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			41		
Science Achievement*	47	52	54	50	52	59	57		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	215
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50

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	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	27	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	50			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	50			

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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	27	Yes	1	1
HSP	55			

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	49			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	45			

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	53			59			47					
SWD	25			30			40				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			35			20				4	
HSP	50			61			38				3	
MUL	64			61							3	
PAC												
WHT	56			64			59				4	
FRL	46			54			45				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	68	55	40	57	43	39	50					
SWD	34	31	20	29	34	24	22					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	80			90								

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	49	40	10	36	23	0	28					
HSP	76	50		61	33							
MUL	70	55		53	33		35					
PAC												
WHT	68	58	50	58	49	54	59					
FRL	61	49	42	47	42	35	37					

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	64	51	41	60	63	41	57					
SWD	38	38	31	35	45	25	41					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	92			92								
BLK	61	42		50	33		42					
HSP	63	42		69	75		64					
MUL	67	53		62	76		56					
PAC												
WHT	63	50	42	58	64	38	57					
FRL	55	43	40	51	54	35	47					

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	49%	1%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	52%	44%	8%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	51%	14%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	51%	-3%

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.

Science proficiency for Black/African American students showed the lowest performance. Factors contributing to the low performance include a need for increased integration of hands on instruction, increased need for ELA science integration, and increase attendance of the subgroup.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline. ELA proficiency declined overall from 68.0% to 56.1% (- 11. 9%). Each subgroup with a testing group greater than 10 also declined. Hispanics, with a testing group of 39 showed the greatest decline from 75.6% proficient in 2022 to 61.5% in 2023 (-14.1%). However, this is still above the overall average. Black/African American students declined from 48.6% in 2022 to 35.1% in 2023 (- 13.5%). This subgroup included 57 tested students. In addition, Black/African American students are now below 41% proficient. SWD declined from 32.1% to 25.4 % (-6.7%). This population is comprised of 59 tested students. Of the SWD, 11 students are also in the Black/African American subgroup.

The factors contributing to this decline include the need to increase differentiated and intensive small group instruction based on the data generated from STAR, FAST, and district assessments (Schoolnet). Teacher feedback indicated that district based assessments, which are administered online, were not used with fidelity. Teachers also shared a need for additional training on interpreting the data gathered

from these assessments. Fluency instruction and data tracking for students reading below the Hasbrook Tindell norms was an additional factor. Fluency coupled with explicit instruction of comprehension strategies contributed to a lack of stamina to read, comprehend, and compare multiple passages.

Attendance data showed ADA of 92.8% which is a decline of 0.9% from 2022 . Black students membership increased by 16% from 2022 and ADA was at 92.4%, 0.4% lower than the school ADA . The SWD subgroup in grades 3-5 showed an ADA was 1.4% lower than the year prior, and the K-5 membership attendance decreasing by 4%. SWD (excluding speech and language) had an ADA of 91.0, which is 1.8% below the school ADA. SWD who are also in the Black/African American subgroup ADA is 89.5% (11 students) .

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.

5th grade math showed the greatest gap to the state average. The factors contributing to this gap include the need to increase the use of manipulatives and pictorial representations to bridge the gap towards the goal of solving abstract paper/pencil multi step math problems. Increasing use of district math assessments (schoolnet), and data monitoring to provide explicit instruction in small groups. Increase teacher familiarity with BEST standards, necessary vocabulary, and content limits. Increase grade level collaborative planning.

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

The component showing the most improvement was Science proficiency for SWD increased from 22.2% to 42.1% proficiency. The factors contributing to this gain was attributed to disseminating the data from Schoolnet and providing explicit hands on remediation based on that data.

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

Potential areas of concern include:
Number of students with > 10% absences

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

1. ELA - 1 year of growth for all membership
2. Black/ African American showing academic growth as measured by state assessments
3. SWD showing academic growth as measured by state assessments
4. Attendance of students showing > 10% absences

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.

For the 22-23 school year, 20.09 % of students were absent more than 10% of total school days. 6.62% of students had greater than 15% absences. The Black/African American subgroup had an ADA of 92.4%, 1.6% lower than the previous school year. The SWD subgroup ADA was 92.0%, which is 1.1% lower than the previous school year. The ADA of students in both subgroups is 90.5% (31 students) .

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the percent of students with > than 10% of total school days by at least 5% for a target of 15.9%.

Increase ADA schoolwide from 92.8% to 95% to include both subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor data weekly and share with students, teachers, and stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@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.)

Informational campaign on the importance of attendance through multiple methods of contact including social media, callouts, marquis, and flyers. Integrate attendance rewards into the PBIS system. (AttendanceWorks.org).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Chronic absence/missing 10% or more of school days- can translate into students having difficulty learning to read by the 3rd grade, achieving in middle school and graduating from high school. (AttendanceWorks.org)

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 2 - Moderate 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.

The leadership team will establish schoolwide protocols for attendance.

The protocols will be monitored by data review

Teachers, students and other stakeholders will receive feedback about attendance on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Continuous monitoring at the end of each month.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Learning Gains in ELA was 55% during 21-22, but shows deficiencies in the following subgroups: Students with Disabilities (29%) and African American/Black (41%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall ELA proficiency* is 56.1% on the 2023 FAST and increases to 62% proficiency on the 2024 FAST PM 3. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, Asian, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic students. ELA proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%. The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 26% point gap on the 2022 ELA FSA to a 13% point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3. The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between Black and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 15% point gap on the 2022 ELA FSA to a 7.5% point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3.
* 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.

Leadership team and teachers will monitor state and district assessment data with additional focus on the students indentified in the SWD and/or Black African American subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@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.)

According to the Institute of Education Sciences, targeted and differentiated small group instruction based on assessment data impact student growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The data for SWD and Black/African American subgroups are below 41% proficiency. In addition, schoolwide proficiency decreased.

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.

Create data sheets to analyze data from all progress monitoring assessments

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 1, 2023

Share data sheets and research based rational with grade levels.

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfi.us)

By When: September 10, 2023

Provide PD on analyzing schoolnet data.

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfi.us)

By When: September 8, 2023

Book study on reading strategies. " The Reading Strategies Book" by J. Serravallo.

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfi.us)

By When: 10/25/2023

Create walkthrough schedule with feedback. Utilize google form to provide feedback.

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfi.us)

By When: September 30, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Learning Gains in Math was 43% proficiency during 21-22 and shows deficiencies in the following subgroups: Students with Disabilities (32%) , African American/Black (23%), Hispanic (33%), and Multiracial (33%)

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall Math proficiency* is 63.1% on the 2023 FAST and will maintain or increase proficiency on the 2024 FAST PM 3. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, Asian, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic students. Math proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%.

The achievement gap in Math learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 36.2% point gap on the 2022 Math FSA to a 18.1% point gap or less on the 2024 Math FAST PM3.

The achievement gap in Math learning gains between Black and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 40.4% point gap on the 2022 Math FSA to a 20.2% point gap or less on the 2024 Math FAST PM3.

* 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.

Leadership team and teachers will monitor state and district assessment data with additional focus on the students identified SWD and/or Black African American subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy Prout (nprout@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.)

According to the Institute of Education Sciences, teachers should us targeted, explicit, and systematic small group instruction based on assessment data. (What Works Clearinghouse)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The subgroup data for Black and SWD subgroups is not at the 41% target.

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.

Utilize K-12 Everglades resources for reteaching and intervention during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023

Create data sheets to analyze data from all progress monitoring assessments

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023

provide PD in analyzing Schoolnet Data

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023

provide PD in analyzing Schoolnet Data

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023

Schedule walkthroughs with feedback

Person Responsible: Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@ecsdfl.us)

By When: 9/30/2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Achievement in Science has not reached 41% proficiency during 22-23 in two subgroups: African American/Black (20%) and Hispanic (37.5%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall Science proficiency* is 47.9% on the 2023 FCAT and will increase proficiency****(for a B) on the 2024 FCAT. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, Asian, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic students. Science proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%. The achievement gap in Science proficiency between Hispanic and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 10.4% point gap on the 2023 Science FCAT to a 5.2% point gap or less on the 2024 Science FCAT.

The achievement gap in Science learning gains between Black and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 27.9% point gap on the 2023 Science FCAT to a 14% point gap or less on the 2024 Science FCAT.

* 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 Science goal will be district created probes, unit tests, and quarterly progress monitoring. The leadership team will conduct monthly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, lab based instruction, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data monthly. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy Prout (nprout@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. Teachers provide immediate corrective feedback on assessment performance to enhance long term learning. (Assessment for all Schools- Tier 1)
2. The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss assessment and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from summative assessments, district progress monitoring, and meet with teachers quarterly and teachers will conduct data chats with students monthly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. The rationale for this strategy is evidenced-based research by John Hattie and Robert Marzano that overt direct instruction, student engagement with the content, and teacher feedback have a high effect size.
2. According to the MeadowCenter.org, 10 Key Policies and Practices for All Schools, decisions are based on student data.

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.

1. Teachers will utilize reports generated from district quarterly tests, and the focus grade book. Teachers will review student assessment and progress monitoring to conduct student data chats, providing feedback to gain a highyield effect size.
2. In-depth professional development will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The PD will be focused around content knowledge, SIP evidence-based strategies, and instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Nancy Prout (nprout@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Quarterly beginning August 23, 2023

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:

15% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

15% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

14% 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 46% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 35% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 51% 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 second 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.

The ELA Proficiency for all identified ESSA subgroups will increase to 50% or higher 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.

Murphy, Jayne, jmurphy3@ecsdfi.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?

Blue Angels 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.

Murphy, Jayne,
jmurphy3@ecsdfl.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/baes>. <https://www.escambiaschools.org/title1>

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 Science. Teachers will share strategies which can be used at home. Teachers send 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/title1>

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)

Our target for the 23-24 school year will be ELA with specific targeted subgroups of Black/African America and SWD. Our used a multitude of grants to fund enrichment to our general curriculum including robotics camps and the military enrichment program.

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))

Title IV, Part A: Provides students with a well-rounded education, supports safe and healthy students, and supports the effective use of technology. Schools benefit through Capturing Kids' Hearts training and the services of the secondary schools guidance TSA.

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))

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))

Schoolnet data analysis PD
Reading strategies book study

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: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$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