Cordova Park Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cordova Park Elementary School

2250 SEMUR RD, 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.

In all that we do, we teach, so that in all children do, they have the opportunity to learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cordova Park Elementary provides an environment in which all children feel happy and safe so that they may learn at their fullest potential.

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
Bauer, Mary	Principal	The principal with the SIP team will develop the goals for targeted area based on data. She will facilitate, train, and implement the school improvement plan with the SIP team to ensure faculty, staff, and stakeholders will understand and purposefully plan targets areas to monitor growth.
Andersen, Michelle	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal with the SIP team will develop the goals for targeted area based on data. She will facilitate, train, and implement the school improvement plan with the SIP team to ensure faculty, staff, and stakeholders will understand and purposefully plan targets areas to monitor growth.
Sullivan, Emily	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The RtI coordinator will support grade level leaders and individual teachers to train, support, and provide resources to successfully implement the targeted goals and monitor growth for targeted groups in the SIP.
Barrs, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Graham, Kari	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Chandler, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Fell, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Fox-McMclellan, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Peaden, Pam	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Morgan-Roy, Darcy	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Roll, Karleen	Teacher, K-12	The grade level teacher will provide continuous support for planning during grade level (PLC) meetings. They will also give feed back to the SIP team of needs and/or successes. They will facilitate data chats to ensure the goals and targeted areas are making growth.
Crawford, Vicki	Instructional Technology	The instructional technology position will provide support to all faculty with tech questions for monitor data with programs that are used by students, assessments on school net, and any other tech questions or concerns teachers may have when collecting and analyzing data to support the monitoring of the SIP goals and targeted areas.

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.

The school advisory council and the PTA board were given information from the latest school wide testing for input. Teachers were also provided data on this information. The information was used to set goals for the targeted areas in the SIP.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored during team meetings (PLC) on a bi-weekly time line. The grade level chair will facility data chats and planning for the established goals and targeted areas set out in the SIP. The SIP team will meet on a regular bases to monitor data and discuss barriers that may arise. This meeting's focus is to monitor process or lack of progress and determine next step action plan. The SIP team will problem solve any barriers and provide necessary resources, training, and/or support to remove the barriers.

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	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) 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	7	26	11	13	10	7	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	8	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	4	2	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	12

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	6	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	14	14	16	12	7	13	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	2	0	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	0	11	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	10	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	6	15	10	2	11	0	0	0	49

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	1	4	3	0	8	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	14	14	16	12	7	13	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	2	0	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	0	11	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	10	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	6	15	10	2	11	0	0	0	49

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	1	4	3	0	8	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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*	71	48	53	76	51	56	78		
ELA Learning Gains				72			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			56		
Math Achievement*	67	50	59	74	46	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				69			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			46		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	77	52	54	75	52	59	79		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		62	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	290
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

	2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	60			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	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%
SWD	54			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	72			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	62			

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	71			67			77					
SWD	31			25			50				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			41							3	
HSP	60			60							2	
MUL	72			48							3	
PAC												
WHT	77			75			84				4	
FRL	55			50			51				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	76	72	64	74	69	63	75					
SWD	42	65	54	42	61	58						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	73		35	73		20					
HSP	63	79		74	71							
MUL	76	65		71	71		70					
PAC												
WHT	83	72	61	81	68	57	84					
FRL	58	71	58	56	67	68	59					

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	78	71	56	72	57	46	79					
SWD	34	57		46	64		60					
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN	70			70								
BLK	25	36		18	14		7					
HSP	81			75								
MUL	74			65								
PAC												
WHT	86	77	67	81	65	60	93					
FRL	61	55	36	56	32	31	53					

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	76%	49%	27%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	57%	12%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	44%	28%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	51%	16%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	47%	26%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	78%	51%	27%	51%	27%

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.

For the 22-23 school year, black students scored an overall proficiency of 41.9% and students with disabilities scored 37.9% proficiency. One contributing factor is that our school was removed from the over capacity list and gained 40-50 students from lower performing schools. This was a transition year for students, families and teachers to build relationships and develop clear understanding to address specific needs (families in crisis and learning gaps) for each individual student.

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

Students with disabilities declined in ELA -10.2% and in math -12.6%. Another concern is the multiracial sub group declined -23.4% in math. The subgroup of students with disabilities increased by numbers when our school was taken off the overcapacity list. An increase in the number of students facilitated an adjustment in the scheduling and planning for students with disabilities during the school year. These adjustments are ongoing to meet the needs of the subgroup.

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.

Cordova Park Elementary had a 19.4% above the state average in ELA, Math was 13.3% above the state and Science was 24.4% above the state average. Cordova Park Elementary has had a long history of academic success for over 20 years. All stakeholders play an important role in the success to the school.

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

Economically disadvantaged students had the greatest increase in proficiency with an increase of +13.4%. With the adjustment in the school subpopulations, we addressed the outside needs of families in crises by using district resources to provide services to meet the needs of individual families to lessen the barriers that would cause a decrease in student success.

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

When looking at attendance, concerns were 1. The amount of tardies for the school year 2. The number of students who were absent 5+ more days. CPE had 1528 tardies and 119 students who missed 5 or more days of school. When breaking down the data to address specific sub groups SWD had 382 tardies and 18 students who missed 5 or more days of school. Black sub group had 622 tardies and 31 students had 5 or more missed days of school. Economically disadvantaged students had 1,086 tardies and 71 students missed 5 or more school days.

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

Priorities for the next school year will be to support student achievement and learning gains in the subpopulation of students with disabilities. Monitoring and supporting families to attendances increase

and reduce in tardies. Monitoring the black and economically subpopulation to ensure growth and proficiency goals are being met.

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 Small Group Instruction

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.

Cordova Park Elementary has historically had a proficiency for ELA and math 63% or more for the past 20 years. To continue the trend of successfully meeting the needs of all student, small group instruction will be a focus for all K-5 classroom in ELA and math. Historical data shows school proficiency for the 17-18 school year was 63%, 18-19 school year was 63%, and 21-22 school year was 70%.

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

Proficiency will be maintained or increased from 73.4% in ELA and 71.3% in Math. on the 2023 FAST to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, Asian, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic students. ELA and math proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 10%.

The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 43 point gap on the 2022 ELA FSA to a 12 point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

The achievement gap in Math learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 43 point gap on the 2022 math FSA to a 12 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.

The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be FAST, STAR, Iready, district assessments K-5 including school net, and school-based assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of purposefully planning for small group instruction, professional development as needs arise for successful implementation, and remediation. The school improvement 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 acceleration, remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Bauer (abauer@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.)

Strengthen the multi-tiered system of support in ELA and math for all students.
1. In ELA all k-5 teachers will screen all students for potential reading problems at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year. (What Works Clearing House - Tier 3) 2. Teachers will provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening. (What Works Clearing House - Tier 3) 3. Teachers will provide systematic math instruction during intervention to develop student understanding of mathematical ideas. (What Works Clearing House - Tier 1)

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

1. Universal screening is a critical first step in identifying students who are at risk for experiencing reading and math difficulties and who might need more instruction. Screening should take place at the beginning of each school year in kindergarten through 5th grade. 2. Tier 2 instruction should take place in small groups that address the major components of reading instruction. 3. Effective interventions for improving the

mathematics achievement of students with difficulties share one key feature: the design of the curricular materials and the instruction provided are systematic.

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 school improvement team will meet with teachers to discuss FAST, STAR, Iready, district assessments K-5 including school net, and school-based assessments for the overall population and specific subgroups. The school improvement team will meet with teachers monthly and teachers will conduct data chats with students from the targeted sub populations monthly.

Person Responsible: Mary Bauer (abauer@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

During grade level professional learning communities, teachers will use collected data to plan for small group instruction and instructional strategies with their peers.

Person Responsible: Mary Bauer (abauer@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly and/or any common academic assessment

The admin team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis in the core content areas to monitor the implementation of small group instruction in ELA and Math. The admin team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and class walks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible: Mary Bauer (abauer@ecsdfl.us)

By When: weekly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Student with disabilities are the lowest performing subgroup for the school. Overall proficiency over the past three years were as follows: 17-18 was 44%, 18-19 was 43%, 21-22 was 53%. The 22-23 proficiency comparison data for students with disabilities are as follows: ELA -10.2% and Math -12.6%.

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

The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 43 point gap on the 2022 ELA FSA to a 12 point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

The achievement gap in Math learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 43 point gap on the 2022 math FSA to a 12 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.

The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be FAST, STAR, Iready, district assessments K-5 including school net, and school-based assessments. The school improvement team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of purposefully planning for cognitive and metacognitive processing strategies, professional development as needs arise for successful implementation, and remediation. The school improvement team will also review school wide data monthly specifically for students with disabilities. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for acceleration, remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Teachers explicitly teach cognitive and metacognitive processing strategies to support memory, attention, and self-regulation of learning. (High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities - Tier 1)

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

Learning involves not only understanding content but also using cognitive processes to solve problems, regulate attention, organize thoughts and materials, and monitor one's own thinking. Self-regulation and metacognitive strategy instruction is integrated into lessons on academic content through modeling and explicit instruction. Students learn to monitor and evaluate their performance in relation to explicit goals and make necessary adjustments to improve learning.

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 school improvement team will meet with ESE teachers and inclusion teachers to discuss FAST, STAR, Iready, district assessments K-5 including school net, and school-based assessments for students with disabilities. The school improvement team will meet with teachers monthly and teachers will conduct data chats with students from the targeted sub populations after every district and progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Mary Bauer (abauer@ecsdfl.us)

By When: monthly

The admin team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis in the core content areas to monitor the implementation purposeful planning outcomes. The admin team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and class walks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible: Mary Bauer (abauer@ecsdfl.us)

By When: weekly

#3. 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.

Student attendance is a high priority to achieve academic success and learning gains for sub population. Cordova Park Elementary had 18.74% who missed more than 5 days of school. 24.3% of economically disadvantage students missed more than 5 days of school. 23.66% of black students missed more than 5 days of school. Cordova Park Elementary had 1,528 tardies for the school year. Economically disadvantage students were tardy 1,086 for the 22-23 school year. Black students were tardy 622 times during the 22-23 school year.

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

The school will increase the attendance rate for economically disadvantaged students and black student to 95% equal to the whole school attendee rate of 94.6%. Both of these subgroups will also decrease their tardies by 50% for the 23-24 school year.

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

The assistant principal will use the district attendance alert report to monitor attendance according to the school district guidelines. Teachers will alert the AP when a student has several check in or check out that is negatively impacting academic achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Andersen (mandersen@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.)

Monitor the progress of all students, and proactively intervene when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems. (Preventing Drop Out - Tier 1)

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

Three key indicators—(1) attendance, (2) behavior, and (3)course performance—are reliable predictors of which students are at risk for dropping out. By continually monitoring students' attendance, behavior, and grades, schools can intervene at the first signs of trouble, before students need intensive support

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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 assistant principal, guidance counselor, and/or school navigator (social worker) will help support attendance by removing barriers that impede attendance and late check in and early check out (tardies). Barries that will be addressed include but are not limited to access to resources such as uniforms, food,

support for parents with utility bills, mental health counseling, coordination of travel for parents to get to medical appointments, school appointments, and family nights.

Person Responsible: Michelle Andersen (mandersen@ecsdfl.us)

By When: weekly