

Escambia County School District

C. A. Weis Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

C. A. Weis Elementary School

2701 N Q ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

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.

Uniting our school, families, and community for shared success and well-being.

Provide the school's vision statement.

C. A. Weis Elementary is a beacon of hope, deeply rooted in compassionate partnerships that are relevant to the growth of our students and community's well being.

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
Thomas, Dr. Kimberly	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Daily walkthroughs and feedback to teachers -Plan Professional Development for teachers as needed -Maintain Master Data Spreadsheet -Support Teachers, Build Capacity -Evaluations for Teachers -LEA for IEP and 504 Meetings -Lead SLT Meetings -School SAC Meetings
Comerford, Trudy	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Daily walkthroughs and feedback to teachers -Plan Professional Development for teachers as needed -Maintain Master Data Spreadsheet -Build Master Schedule -Support Teachers, Build Capacity -TGIF Weekly newsletters (infusing bits of PD for teachers) -Evaluations for Teachers -LEA for IEP and 504 Meetings -Lead SLT Meetings -School SAC Meetings -Title I E-Binder -Testing Coordinator
Watson, Erica	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Daily walkthroughs and feedback to teachers -Plan Professional Development for teachers as needed -Maintain Master Data Spreadsheet -Support Teachers, Build Capacity -Support Long-Term Substitutes, Build Capacity -School SAC Meetings
Hill, Bridget	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Student Counseling -Attendance Child Study Team Meetings -Family Nights -Parent of the Month -504 Plans/Meetings -Gifted Screenings -School Social Worker Referrals -Attendance for Principal Pal's (Perfect Attendance Lunch)
English, Brianna	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans a program of study that, as much as possible, meets the individual needs, interests and abilities of students. 2. Creates a classroom environment that is conducive to learning and appropriate to the maturity and interests of students. 3. Guides the learning process toward the achievement of curriculum goals and – in harmony with the goals – establishes clear objectives for all lessons, units, projects and the like, to communicate these objectives to students. 4. Employs instructional methods and materials that are most appropriate for meeting stated objectives.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Assesses the accomplishments of students on a regular basis and provides progress reports as required. 6. Counsels with colleagues, students and/or parents on a regular basis. 7. Assists the administration in implementing all policies and/or rules governing student life and conduct, and, for the classroom, develops reasonable rules of classroom behavior and procedure and maintains order in the classroom in a fair and just manner. 8. Plans and supervises purposeful assignments for teacher aide(s) and/or volunteer(s) and, cooperatively with department heads, evaluates their job performance. 9. Strives to maintain and improve professional competence. 10. Attends staff meetings and serves on staff committees as required.
James, Christina	Teacher, ESE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans a program of study that, as much as possible, meets the individual needs, interests and abilities of students. 2. Creates a classroom environment that is conducive to learning and appropriate to the maturity and interests of students. 3. Guides the learning process toward the achievement of curriculum goals and – in harmony with the goals – establishes clear objectives for all lessons, units, projects and the like, to communicate these objectives to students. 4. Employs instructional methods and materials that are most appropriate for meeting stated objectives. 5. Assesses the accomplishments of students on a regular basis and provides progress reports as required. 6. Counsels with colleagues, students and/or parents on a regular basis. 7. Assists the administration in implementing all policies and/or rules governing student life and conduct, and, for the classroom, develops reasonable rules of classroom behavior and procedure and maintains order in the classroom in a fair and just manner. 8. Plans and supervises purposeful assignments for teacher aide(s) and/or volunteer(s) and, cooperatively with department heads, evaluates their job performance. 9. Strives to maintain and improve professional competence. 10. Attends staff meetings and serves on staff committees as required.
Olige Brannon, Priteyja	Teacher, K-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans a program of study that, as much as possible, meets the individual needs, interests and abilities of students. 2. Creates a classroom environment that is conducive to learning and appropriate to the maturity and interests of students. 3. Guides the learning process toward the achievement of curriculum goals and – in harmony with the goals – establishes clear objectives for all lessons, units, projects and the like, to communicate these objectives to students. 4. Employs instructional methods and materials that are most appropriate for meeting stated objectives. 5. Assesses the accomplishments of students on a regular basis and provides progress reports as required. 6. Counsels with colleagues, students and/or parents on a regular basis. 7. Assists the administration in implementing all policies and/or rules

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>governing student life and conduct, and, for the classroom, develops reasonable rules of classroom behavior and procedure and maintains order in the classroom in a fair and just manner.</p> <p>8. Plans and supervises purposeful assignments for teacher aide(s) and/or volunteer(s) and, cooperatively with department heads, evaluates their job performance.</p> <p>9. Strives to maintain and improve professional competence.</p> <p>10. Attends staff meetings and serves on staff committees as required.</p>
James, Cassandra		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Rti Communication with Teachers -Train and support teachers in Rtl process -Intervention Walkthroughs -Family Nights -Attendance Monitoring

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.

Stakeholder input was provided in a SAC meeting in January 2023. The following stakeholders were present: Parents, Community Members, School Employees (instructional and educational support), and school administration. During this time we reviewed and revised our School Parent & Family Engagement Plan as well as our School Compact. We also discussed funds, completed our Mid-Year SIP Review in CIMS, and building school staff capacity.

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 goals will be set for students for FAST and for unit/topic/module assessments throughout the school year. This will translate into class goal and grade level goal percentages. These goals will be compared to real-time data throughout the school year. Scores will be entered into a Master Data Sheet where it can easily be compared to the goals set. Additionally, the Master Data Sheet will allow for patterns and trends to emerge to determine which students are or are not making adequate progress towards goals.

Students receiving Tier III Reading Intervention will be evaluated diagnostically and strategically scheduled in groups with the most appropriate intervention (95% Group, Sonday System, Janet Richardson, etc).

A school-wide assessment calendar has been created which correlates with our school district's pacing plans in ELA and Math as well as Science for 4th and 5th Grade. Following these assessments, class

proficiency percentages will be calculated using a pre-made Excel with built-in formulas. Grade level proficiency percentages will then be calculated as well as 3rd-5th combined. Following assessments, students who met their individual goals will receive incentives.

Data Meetings will be held biweekly to review student data, identify barriers, identify trends and patterns, identify student needs and deficits, and to create action plans to meet the needs.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) 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 2017-18: D
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	25	45	33	48	31	22	0	0	0	204	
One or more suspensions	0	4	12	12	16	9	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	3	17	21	6	0	0	0	50	
Course failure in Math	0	4	11	17	9	8	0	0	0	49	
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.	6	6	25	38	8	8	0	0	0	91	

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	7	17	22	14	9	0	0	0	69

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	20	32	40	53	20	25	0	0	0	190	
One or more suspensions	0	11	12	23	11	11	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	25	21	3	4	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	8	19	5	9	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	12	23	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	22	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	26	21	2	4	0	0	0	54	

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	5	21	29	11	24	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	20	32	40	53	20	25	0	0	0	190	
One or more suspensions	0	11	12	23	11	11	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	25	21	3	4	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	8	19	5	9	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	12	23	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	22	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	26	21	2	4	0	0	0	54	

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	5	21	29	11	24	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	0	0	21	2	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	28	48	53	26	51	56	27		
ELA Learning Gains				57			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			53		
Math Achievement*	37	50	59	36	46	50	20		
Math Learning Gains				66			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			53		
Science Achievement*	48	52	54	21	52	59	32		
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	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	136
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

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	325
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	20	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	43			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	35	Yes	2	
FRL	33	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP				

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	50			
PAC				
WHT	36	Yes	1	
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	28			37			48					
SWD	18			22			20				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			36			44				4	
HSP	43			43							2	
MUL	55			36							2	
PAC												
WHT	25			45							2	
FRL	27			37			46				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	26	57	50	36	66	69	21					
SWD	21	54	38	24	63		7					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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	22	55	48	32	66	70	13					
HSP												
MUL	50			50								
PAC												
WHT	27			45								
FRL	25	56	48	33	64	69	19					

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	27	41	53	20	35	53	32					
SWD	10	18		10	26	45	15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	39	53	15	35	60	22					
HSP	54			46								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62			48								
FRL	24	41	53	19	36	56	30					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	49%	-10%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	58%	-17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	24%	44%	-20%	50%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	35%	51%	-16%	59%	-24%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	58%	-22%	61%	-25%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	51%	-7%	51%	-7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data shows that Students with Disabilities (SWD) and students who are white scored in low proficiencies in ELA, Math, and Science. In regards to SWD, one contributing factor is that we focused much of our extra resources on targeted students to meet proficiency because school grades were based on proficiency only for the 2022-2023 school year. In regards to students who are white, we had a total of only twelve in our membership. In science (5th grade) that number was below 10; therefore, we did not receive a score in that cell box altogether.

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

The greatest decline was -2.3% in white ELA students' proficiency. The contributing factor was the total number of white students with disabilities was significantly low in the membership group.

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 greatest difference compared to the state average is 3rd grade ELA (-27.8%) and 4th grade math (-26.2%). In 3rd grade, a large number of these students missed a great amount of instruction due to COVID-19 their 1st grade year which was a huge foundation year for phonics and reading instruction. A lot of these students missed a large portion of school or was on remote learning. In regards to 4th grade

math, these students missed their foundational years of math instruction as well due to COVID-19. In both grade levels, very few students were retained and were promoted lacking foundational skills.

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

Fifth grade math showed the most improvement when compared to the state proficiency scores. We noticed our former 4th grade teacher's math scores were significantly higher than her colleagues so we moved her to 5th grade to see if we could have a greater impact. As a result, the same cohort of students moved from 42% proficient in 4th grade to 51.1% in 5th grade math.

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

One potential area of concern that remains is attendance and tardies.

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

Student with disabilities
White students with disabilities
3rd ELA proficiency
4th grade math proficiency

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After reviewing data, one area of focus will be attendance and tardies for 3rd-5th grade as it relates to maintaining a positive culture and environment. We identified students with disabilities and white students as scoring below the 41% federal index as it relates to the minimum requirement. 45% of third grade students with disabilities were absent 5 or more times during the fourth quarter during the 2022-2023 school year. 42% of fourth grade students with disabilities were absent 5 or more times during the fourth quarter during the 2022-2023 school year. 27% of fifth grade students with disabilities were absent 5 or more times during the fourth quarter during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be a decrease of 10% or more of 3rd - 5th grade students with 5 or more absences within each quarter.

There will be a decrease of 10% or more of 3rd - 5th grade students' with disabilities with 5 or more absences within each quarter.

There will be a decrease of 10% or more of 3rd - 5th grade white students with 5 or more absences within each quarter.

Monitoring:

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

We will meet monthly with the guidance counselor, school district social worker, and team to discuss attendance and tardy data. Additionally, we will share this information with stakeholders. Students with disabilities and white students' attendance data will be reviewed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget Hill (bhill@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.)

Leadership will continue to establish school-wide protocols for attendance (goal = 90% attendance rate). Leadership will develop expectations and protocol for students missing 5+ days within a quarter. The protocols will be monitored by weekly data review. Attendance rates by grade level will be shared with students and staff every Monday morning (based off the previous week). This information will be shared with families on the school website and social media. Families will also receive educational resources regarding the impact of attendance on education from AttendanceWorks.org. Students with perfect attendance in a month will be invited to participate in the monthly Principal's PALs Lunch (Perfect Attendance Lunch).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Monitoring and communicating attendance (goals and current data) with all stakeholders will encourage an effort to decrease absences and tardies.

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.

Progress monitor weekly attendance by grade level. Share with students and staff weekly. Share with all stakeholders

Incentivize attendance by offering a monthly lunch with the principal.

Share educational resources with families and help them understand the impact of attendance on education.

Person Responsible: Bridget Hill (bhill@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly

#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.

After reviewing the data, 3rd grade ELA proficiency scores continue to be an area of concern (22% proficient in the 2022-2023 school year). This is a 27.8% difference compared to the state's data. With the new school grade requirement adding an additional cell that directly relates to 3rd grade proficiency alone, it is imperative that we focus on this particular grade level.

3rd-5th grade students with disabilities were below the Federal Index at 35%.
White 3rd-5th students were also below the Federal Index at 36%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in Grade 3 will increase ELA proficiency by 13%, from 22% to 35%.
Students in Grades 3-5 with disabilities will increase ELA proficiency by 10%, from 22% to 32%.
White students in Grades 3-5 will increase ELA proficiency by 10%, from 25% to 35%.

Monitoring:

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

- We will strategically schedule students with reading intervention teachers and ESE teachers to provide meaningful and quality reading intervention. Their progress from level to level (mastery) will be collected and noted.
- Leadership will meet monthly with the reading intervention specialists, the RTI Coordinator, as well as the exceptional educational teachers to discuss data and resources being implemented.
- Goals will be established for individual students, classes, and grade levels for unit assessments. Following unit assessments, progress is monitored and students receive incentives for reaching goals.
- Goals will be established for individual students, classes, and grade levels for FAST. Following PM2, progress will be reviewed and students receive incentives for being on track (making adequate progress towards their PM3 goal).
- Teachers will meet biweekly to analyze data and determine plans or adjustments for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dr. Kimberly Thomas (kthomas2@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.)

We will strategically schedule students with reading intervention teachers and ESE teachers to provide meaningful and quality reading intervention (95% Group resources, Sonday System resources, Jan Richardson, or others).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will continue to provide meaningful and quality reading intervention for students in ELA, with guidance from our district ELA department.

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. Schedule Common-Planning for grade levels at least one day per week.
2. Schedule after-school extra planning for grade levels with stipends for teachers.
3. Schedule bi-weekly data meetings.
4. Schedule bi-weekly Professional Development, as needed.
5. Determine "Target" students for Proficiency and establish goals for FAST and Unit Assessments.
6. Monitor quality of instruction in class walkthroughs and provide feedback for growth.
7. Monitor Unit Assessment Data and FAST Progress Monitoring Data and make adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible: Dr. Kimberly Thomas (kthomas2@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Beginning of the school year

#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.

After reviewing the data, 4th grade Math proficiency scores are an area of concern (32% proficient in the 2022-2023 school year). This is a 26.2% difference compared to the state's data. 4th Grade Math proficiency dropped significantly compared to the year prior.

3rd-5th grade students with disabilities were below the Federal Index at 35%.

White 3rd-5th grade students were also below the Federal Index at 36%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in Grade 4 will increase MATH proficiency by 10%, from 32% to 42%.

Students in Grades 3-5 with disabilities will increase Math proficiency by 10%, from 20% to 30%.

White students in Grades 3-5 will increase Math proficiency by 10%, from 45% to 55%.

Monitoring:

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

-We strategically are utilizing our teacher assistants so that they are working with small groups of students with targeted lessons based on students' needs.

-Goals have been established for individual students, classes, and grade levels for unit assessments. Following unit assessments, progress is monitored and students receive incentives for reaching goals.

-Goals have been established for individual students, classes, and grade levels for FAST. Following PM2, progress will be reviewed and students receive incentives for being on track (making adequate progress towards their PM3 goal).

-Teachers will meet biweekly to analyze data and determine plans or adjustments for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trudy Comerford (tcomerford@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.)

We will utilize our intervention resources and adjust groupings as needed. We will continue to utilize the Reflex Fluency Math program to increase proficiency in basic math operations. We are adjusting students' i-Ready pathways as needed and assigning teacher-assigned lessons as needed

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With guidance from our district's Math department, we are backwards planning and implementing recommended resources.

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. Schedule Common-Planning for grade levels at least one day per week.
2. Schedule after-school extra planning for grade levels with stipends for teachers.
3. Schedule bi-weekly data meetings.
4. Schedule bi-weekly Professional Development, as needed.
5. Determine "Target" students for Proficiency and establish goals for FAST and Unit Assessments.
6. Monitor quality of instruction in class walkthroughs and provide feedback for growth.
7. Monitor Unit Assessment Data and FAST Progress Monitoring Data and make adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible: Trudy Comerford (tcomerford@ecsdf.us)

By When:

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:

22% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

64% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

77% 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 78% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 57% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 60% on the 2023 FAST.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

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

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

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Thomas, Dr. Kimberly, kthomas2@ecsdf.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?

C.A. Weis 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.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Information regarding the SIP and SWP will be provided to stakeholders in the following methods: school webpage, SAC Meetings, Community School Cabinet Meetings, and Annual Title I Meeting.

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))

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs by:

- Sharing resources with families (family resource center)
- Hosting family engagement nights in October 2023 and February 2024 in collaboration with our Community Partnership School (CPS)
- Community School monthly newsletters
- Social Media
- SAC meetings

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 after-school SAIL Program provides enrichment and accelerated academic opportunities to reinforce ELA and Math curriculum by using data (shared in our Master Data Spreadsheet). Groups in SAIL are organized and planned strategically so that students' needs are being addressed.

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))

Our after-school SAIL Program is now being funded by state and local resources including Escambia Children's Trust. The Escambia County Children's Trust is a new local service provided to all community stakeholders and our Community School partner, Children's Home Society, along with the Escambia County Public Schools coordinated efforts to develop and integrate services to continue our collaborative partnership.

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
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No