Escambia County School District

Brown Barge Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Brown Barge Middle School

201 HANCOCK LN, Pensacola, FL 32503

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.

The mission of Brown-Barge Middle School is to meet the specific needs of each student through the implementation of a program of academic excellence which incorporates technology into an integrative curriculum. Our thematic integrative curriculum includes individual and cooperative learning experiences designed to foster and promote a positive school culture. Mutual respect, ethical behavior, pride and integrity in one's self, school and community and success for all students will be the realization of this mission.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that each student, working at his or her own pace, has the right to pursue academic, social, and personal goals in a nurturing, supportive environment. We believe that secure students will be motivated to accept the challenge of the differentiated and integrative curriculum designed to produce academic excellence at Brown-Barge Middle School. The ultimate goal at Brown-Barge is to assist students in becoming happy,
productive, and knowledgeable young people who believe in themselves and their ability to make a positive contribution to society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Penrose, Janet	Principal	
Jackson, Lauri	Assistant Principal	
Hale, Cecelia	Dean	
Fryman, Danielle	School Counselor	
McGugin, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	Math and Gifted Elective teacher at Brown-Barge. Works closely with teachers to develop curriculum. Works closely with parents to assist their children in succeeding at our school. Member of the Curriculum and Standards Management Team. Assists in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Imhof, Kristy	Instructional Media	Media Specialist at Brown-Barge. Works closely with teachers to develop curriculum and incorporate literature into their lessons. Member of Literacy Leadership Team and Literacy Management Team. Allows students who need extra time on assessments to continue in the library; suggests materials for specific students or small groups with subject area deficiencies, including Star 360; assists teachers in addressing remediation needs as assessed by Star 360 and iLit 45. Assists in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Mellor, David	Teacher, K-12	Math and Stream teacher at Brown-Barge. Strong in science field. Works closely with teachers to develop curriculum. Works closely with parents to assist their children in succeeding at our school. Member of Vision Management Team. Assists in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Crittenden, Kathleen	Teacher, ESE	ESE teacher at Brown-Barge. Works closely with Guidance Counselor, administration, and teachers to provide assistance to our ESE population. Point of contact for all ESE paperwork and working with our ESE students. Suggests materials for specific students or small groups with subject area deficiencies, including Star 360; assists teachers in addressing remediation needs as assessed by Star 360 and iLit 45. Works closely with parents to assist their children in succeeding at our school. Assists in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.

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.

Data is reviewed from previous year and the starting goals are created. Teachers are then asked for input on the goals and changes are made based on their feedback. We then share the SIP with our School Advisory Council to ensure we are meeting the needs of all students.

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))

Our plan is to mark the calendar for check in dates throughout the school year. Our Leadership Team will review our goals to ensure we are staying on track with the plan that has been implemented. Changes will be made as needed.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners (ELL) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	15	18	19	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	5	21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4

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	2	1	1	4

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	19	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	18
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	0	2	5	7

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	19	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	18
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	0	2	5	7

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	
Students retained two or more times	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*	73	40	49	81	42	50	80		
ELA Learning Gains				57			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			50		
Math Achievement*	83	45	56	82	33	36	80		
Math Learning Gains				64			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			44		
Science Achievement*	48	40	49	64	43	53	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	59	68	70	50	58	76		
Middle School Acceleration	81	73	73	79	47	49	90		
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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	614
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	64			
ELL	75			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	58			
HSP	64			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	65			

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				
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	59			
HSP	61			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	60			

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	73			83			48	69	81			
SWD	67			60							2	
ELL	60			90							2	
AMI												
ASN	82			92			57	83	100		5	
BLK	60			69			28	53	81		5	
HSP	75			85			47	69	44		5	
MUL	77			84			62	61	83		5	
PAC												
WHT	74			86			53	72	83		5	
FRL	70			80			42	57	75		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	81	57	58	82	64	59	64	70	79			
SWD												
ELL	71	50		86	71							
AMI												
ASN	85	63	69	90	88	70	83	88	93			
BLK	68	53	61	63	61	55	36	59	71			
HSP	76	52	50	86	60		21	60	80			
MUL	84	63	65	84	68	76	68	63	88			
PAC												
WHT	85	57	54	86	60	52	77	74	77			
FRL	72	48	53	70	61	52	42	63	79			

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	80	57	50	80	49	44	62	76	90			
SWD	67	58		45	36							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	86	74		84	56			92	90			
BLK	66	50	39	56	33	26	19	52	83			
HSP	64	55	38	73	47	54	50	47	80			
MUL	72	57	50	85	55	67	69	75	80			
PAC												
WHT	89	57	59	89	53	52	75	88	94			
FRL	73	55	47	69	42	35	51	60	84			

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	72%	37%	35%	47%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	38%	25%	47%	16%
06	2023 - Spring	75%	37%	38%	47%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	41%	42%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	93%	48%	45%	48%	45%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	31%	37%	55%	13%

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	86%	38%	48%	50%	36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	48%	47%	48%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	55%	14%	66%	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 is our lowest performer (48.2%). Our program is designed to incorporate science standards within the teaching of the stream curriculum. Not all streams include a high level of science. Some streams are more history heavy.

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

According to our Statewide Science Assessment, Science showed the greatest decline from 64% in the 21/22 SY to 48.2% in the 22/23 SY. Our 8th grade students did not have daily science instruction which contributed to the decline. We need to ensure that our 8th grade students are receiving daily science instruction. They are capable of doing well on the test but need a solid review of previous content that was taught. We also need to ensure that the stream content has robust opportunities to learn science concepts in a way that students can understand and apply to their daily lives.

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.

We are still above the state average in all areas.

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

According to our FAST PM3 data, Math showed the most improvement with 82.3% in 21/22 SY to 86.0% in 22/23 SY. We began using the new standards, resources, etc. that allowed our students to understand the content that needed to be taught. It was grade level specific and structured by student performance levels. Teachers meet at least once a month to look at curriculum standards to ensure they are on track for teaching what is expected at each grade level.

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

Our PMDR data reflects that we had a spike in absences during our 2nd quarter of school. The African American and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups had the largest amount of absences of our subgroups. African American subgroup jumped from 104 absences in Q1 to 206 absences in Q2. Economically Disadvantaged subgroup jumped from 342 absences in Q1 to 647 absences in Q2. We need to find out who these students are and why they are missing school.

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

Science and ELA will be our highest priorities. We want to take a look at the standards that should be covered in each of the streams, make sure the lessons being prepared include these standards and they are being taught at the intended level. We also want to take a look at our attendance to determine the factors leading to the absences.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Achievement in ELA has declined in proficiency from the 2021-2022 to the 2022-2023 school year. In past years, we have done well on the writing component, it was not included in the ELA score this year showing a decline in our proficiency.
2021-2022: 81.2% proficient
2022-2023: 70.4 % proficient

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

ELA proficiency will go from 70.4% (proficiency*) on the 2023 FAST to 82% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ESSA subgroup including African American/Black students. ELA proficiency for ESSA subgroup will increase by 50%.

The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between African American and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 23.4% point gap on the 2022 ELA FSA to a 11 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.

Reading and Writing PM testing throughout the year. Progress Learning beginning of the year assessment and continuous monitoring of individual students. Teachers and administration will review Progress Learning data at the beginning of each trimester. This will give the new stream of teachers a chance to see their students' strengths and weaknesses while allowing us to check on progress. Parents will receive updates on their students' progress as needed since the ongoing need for this program will work with a smaller group of our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janet Penrose (jpenrose@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.)

Our Literacy Plan will use our areas of focus to strengthen the needs of our students in regards to reading. We will be working on increasing vocabulary, daily writing across the curriculum, and independent reading.

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

Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Tier 2 evidence (Practice Guide 21)

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.

Teachers will note the students areas of weakness from last year's assessment and use this knowledge for follow up questioning during/after sustained silent reading (SSR) time to ensure students are able to practice restating what they are reading.

Person Responsible: Janet Penrose (jpenrose@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Teachers will do this on a weekly basis.

We will being a "Word of the Week" to begin improving our vocabulary knowledge. These words will be used in many areas of learning throughout the week to ensure our students have exposure to words in various contexts.

Person Responsible: Kristy Imhof (kimhof@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Begin no later than September 1st.

Using the Progress Learning platform we will start with the beginning of the year assessment to determine the needs of our students then use it as support throughout the year for our struggling readers. Teachers are able to monitor progress within the program as well as add lessons to meet the individual needs of our students.

Person Responsible: Janet Penrose (jpenrose@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Baseline assessment will be done during the first two weeks of school.

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

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

Monitor the progress of all students, and proactively intervene when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems. 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)

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

Overall attendance was 92% during the 2022-2023 school year. Overall attendance will increase by 3 or more points to be 95% or higher for 2023-2024 school year.

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

Leadership team will monitor attendance, behavior and/or academic problems to check for trends and make adjustments when needed to ensure the success of our students. Attendance is one of our Weekly Measures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Fryman (dfryman1@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.)

The leadership will establish school-wide protocols for attendance and behavior. The protocols will be monitored by data review and class walks. Teachers and students will receive feedback about attendance and behavior on a monthly basis.

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

Practice Guide 24 (Preventing secondary dropout)

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.

The behavior team will analyze PMDR data, PBIP's, ESE IEP's, and other behavior data. The team will meet with teachers at the beginning of the year to discuss student behavior and data directly tied to student disabilities pertaining to data. The team will then meet monthly with teachers to discuss data to inform next steps.

Person Responsible: Cecelia Hale (chale@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be ongoing on a bi-weekly basis throughout the year.

#3. 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.

Our Science proficiency for 22-23 school year is 48.2%. Our African American (27.8%) and ELL (25%) are our lowest subgroups for Science.

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

Brown-Barge's Science proficiency will go from 48.2% on the 2023 SSA to 64% or higher on the 2024 SSA school-wide. All ESSA subgroups will have achievement proficiency of 41% or higher.

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

To ensure the Sunshine State Standards for 6-8 are being taught before the 8th graders complete the SSA, teachers will check the standards matrix during pre and post planning. Our Science Curriculum Management Team will be doing a standards check for each stream to ensure the standards are being addressed.
Team leaders and administrators will ensure that two or more standards-based labs occur during each stream. The School Leadership Team will ensure that professional development opportunities on science are provided. Impact teachers will work together to administer the 3rd quarter Science assessment and utilize the data to drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauri Jackson (ljackson2@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 10 Key Practices for Assessment in Schools, when school leadership focuses on teacher capacity on understanding curriculum and standards, students' academic performance increases.

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

Knowing the curriculum and standards will ensure teachers are teaching to the level needed for our students.

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.

The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss prior year's SSA data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from progress monitoring, and meet with teachers for data chats.

Person Responsible: Lauri Jackson (ljackson2@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Within the first two weeks of school.

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, abstract to concrete representations of science concepts, primary and secondary source analysis, academic language, and student discourse. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible: Lauri Jackson (ljackson2@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Before the end of the first semester.

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes.

Person Responsible: Lauri Jackson (ljackson2@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be done weekly.