Ferry Pass Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Ferry Pass Elementary School

8310 N DAVIS HWY, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Ferry Pass Elementary School is to develop self-confident, lifelong learners. We recognize that partnerships among schools and parents are critical to guarantee students' success. Our goal is to create a climate of mutual trust and respect that supports substantial parent involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create an environment of collaboration for both students and teachers to increase achievement that promotes student development in all areas.

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
Fieg, Catrena	Principal	
Bryan, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Dupree, Dynita	Other	
Burt, Gethia	Instructional Coach	
Nickerson, Dorothy	Other	
Rockwell, Patricia	Teacher, ESE	
Nobles, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Bridges, Diondria	Teacher, K-12	

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.

A faculty meeting was held in April 2023 to discuss Title I and SIP Development for the 2023-2024 school year. A School Advisory Council meeting was held in May 2023 to solicit input from the members. We plan to continue receiving input and sharing out our progress through the Title I Annual meeting that will be held in September 2023, as well as our monthly SAC meetings that will be held throughout the school year.

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))

Ferry Pass Elementary School will use monthly data meetings to help monitor our implementation of the school improvement goals, as well as to progress monitor the effectiveness of our plan. The leadership team will meet weekly to analyze the walkthrough data to determine the need for teacher supports, instructional adjustments, and any additional interventions to ensure the academic goals are reached for all students.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	17	42	28	17	15	26	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	2	6	4	4	4	10	0	0	0	30
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	15	11	5	3	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	8	14	2	0	0	0	31
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.	4	4	15	6	4	7	0	0	0	40

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	6	8	7	7	9	0	0	0	37

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	10	7	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	9

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	18	30	28	28	21	17	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	2	10	4	5	10	7	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	5	7	14	1	2	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	9	3	4	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	14	21	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	23	15	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	5	8	10	5	7	0	0	0	39

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	8	4	12	5	14	0	0	0	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	18	30	28	28	21	17	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	2	10	4	5	10	7	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	5	7	14	1	2	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	9	3	4	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	14	21	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	23	15	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	5	8	10	5	7	0	0	0	39

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	8	4	12	5	14	0	0	0	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	44	48	53	41	51	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				56			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			57		
Math Achievement*	47	50	59	47	46	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				61			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			65		
Science Achievement*	54	52	54	51	52	59	50		
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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	196
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	52

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	364
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	27	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	1
HSP	45			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	62			

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	59			
FRL	48			

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	44			47			54					
SWD	18			23			30				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			29			39				4	
HSP	46			54							3	
MUL	70			60							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			59			62				4	
FRL	39			40			50				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	41	56	47	47	61	61	51					
SWD	21	34	25	24	41	50	29					
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	25	45	45	36	52	50	28					
HSP	61	64		52	71							
MUL	43	64		43	50							
PAC												
WHT	55	63	40	60	69		64					
FRL	34	51	45	41	57	59	48					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	45	52	57	41	44	65	50					
SWD	20	65	77	16	59	77	18					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	49	46	30	44	67	33					
HSP	62	54		45	43		71					
MUL	40	42		50	45		45					
PAC												
WHT	51	58		45	41		61					
FRL	42	51	58	38	49	77	52					

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	47%	49%	-2%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	51%	7%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	47%	-8%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	51%	2%	51%	2%

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.

SWD ELA performed at a 17.2% proficiency rate. Contributing factors include the lack of small groups and targeted instruction.

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

SWD ELA declined 2.2% from 2022 to 2023. This decline is attributed to the lack of targeted standards-based instruction.

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.

Overall, Math is 7.5% below the state average. 5th Grade performed 15.9% below the state average. 4th Grade performed 10.3% below the state average, while 3rd Grade performed 2.1% above the state average. Lack of targeted instruction on the Big-M, MTRS, and BEST Fluency standards.

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

Multiracial student proficiency increased by 27.1% from 42.9% in 2021-2022 to 70% in 2022-2023 in ELA. Multiracial student proficiency increased by 17. 1% from 42.9% in 2021-2022 to 60% in 2022-2023 in Math. Foundational skills were implemented for the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Attendance, tardiness, and office discipline referrals of students who are identified as Economically Disadvantaged students

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

ELA and Math Learning Gains for SWD and Black students. Attendance and tardies for Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

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

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

The percentage of students with 5 or more days absent reached a high of 42.72% based on the 2022-2023 PMDR Early Warning data.

During the 2022-2023 school year, there were 147 (27%) students that received a total of 173 (32%) minor infractions based on the Discipline data report for minor infractions in FOCUS.

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

The school will decrease the percentage of students with 5 or more days absent by 10% (32.72%).
The school will decrease the number of minor infractions by 20% (96).

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

The early warning system will be used to identify students at risk for the attendance and discipline indicators. The leadership team will use the student information system(FOCUS) to review attendance and discipline data weekly. Child Study Attendance meetings and MTSS meetings will be scheduled as the data indicates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Schools have a multitiered system in place that supports the behavioral practices—from the school wide to the individualized levels.

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

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

1. According to 10 Keys to Behavior Practice Guide from The Meadow Center, having a multitiered system in place that supports the behavior practices from the school wide to the individualized levels shows a positive impact on student achievement, behavior, and attendance.

2. According to Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools, monitoring the progress of all students, and proactively intervening when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems has a positive impact on student achievement, behavior, and attendance

Tier 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 navigator will help support behaviors by removing barriers that impede positive behavior and attendance. The navigator will provide resources such as 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: Jessica Bryan (jbryan@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Dorothy Nickerson (dnickerson1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

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

Person Responsible: Dorothy Nickerson (dnickerson1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

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

Person Responsible: Dorothy Nickerson (dnickerson1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

The leadership team will identify individual teacher needs and coaching supports for teachers who continue to struggle with behavior and classroom management. The PBIS coach will utilize the coaching cycle- classroom observation, planning with teachers for behavior strategies, model and/or co-teach, debrief. This cycle will continue as needed and be finalized once further classroom visits determine the coaching can stop. The PBIS coach will provide daily updates on coaching supports in the daily stand-up.

Person Responsible: Dorothy Nickerson (dnickerson1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: as needed, determined by data

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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

Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency for the past 3 years and shows deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessment: Students with Disabilities 17.7% and African American/Black 23.9%.

Achievement in Math has not reached 41% proficiency for the past 3 years and shows deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessment: Students with Disabilities 26.7% and African American/Black 34.8%.

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

ELA (49.3%) and Math (50.5%) proficiency on the 2023 FAST will increase to 52% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ESSA subgroups include SWD and African American/Black students. ELA and Math proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%.

The achievement gap in ELA and Math learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from a 24-point gap on the 2022 ELA and Math FSA to a 12-point gap or less on the 2024 ELA and Math FAST PM3. * Proficiency levels indicated for 2023 are based on levels set as of July 2023.

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the ELA/Math goals will be district created probes, unit tests, and quarterly progress monitoring. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. School leadership ensures that teachers have a shared understanding of the curriculum and standards across the grades.

2. Strengthen the multi-tiered system of supports for all students.

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

1. According to the 10 Key Policies and Practices for Assessment in Schools from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, understanding how content builds through the grades improves instruction as teachers prepare students for the content they will encounter and that will be assessed in the next grade level.

2. According to the 10 Key Policies and Practices for All Schools from The University of Texas at Austin/ The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, multitiered systems are in place to support the

academic and behavioral progress of all students and to allow educators to quickly intervene with students who are struggling to be successful.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will monitor the implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan using the practice profile walkthrough tools. The Florida Literacy Practice Profile walkthrough tool provides a framework by which to view instruction that is evidence-based.

Person Responsible: Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing

The leadership team will provide professional development to faculty on the Practice Profiles.

Person Responsible: Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

A common grade level time will be provided and there will be a common Planning Protocol used school wide which includes coming prepared to planning, a focus on the benchmarks, and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Jessica Bryan (jbryan@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly

School leadership will visit classrooms weekly to look for B.E.S.T.-aligned ELA instruction and adherence to Florida's Revised Formula for Success, 6 + 4 + T1 +T2 + T3. Feedback will be provided to teachers regarding the practice profiles.

Person Responsible: Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly

Coaching and frequent feedback will be provided to teachers.

Person Responsible: Dynita Dupree (ddupree@ecsdfl.us)

By When: As needed, determined by data from classroom walkthroughs

Utilize the BIG M to identify instructional strategies to support benchmark aligned instruction and tiered strategies to support differentiation.

Person Responsible: Gethia Burt (gburt@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

Utilize the MTR's (Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning) to engage students in discussing mathematical thinking and reasoning

Person Responsible: Dynita Dupree (ddupree@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

Provide professional development through the mathematics department focused on the shifts of the benchmarks and the implementation of instructional practices to allow students to learn the content of the benchmark.

Person Responsible: Dynita Dupree (ddupree@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

The professional development will be followed up with classroom walks with the administration and/or the math department to identify the shifts and implementation with feedback given to the teachers.

Person Responsible: Jessica Bryan (jbryan@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly

Coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, word problems and student discourse. Coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible: Dynita Dupree (ddupree@ecsdfl.us)

By When: As needed, determined by data from classroom walkthroughs

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

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.)

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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:
13% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early

Literacy Assessment.
44% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early
Literacy Assessment.
31% 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 51% on the 2023 FAST.
Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 49% on the 2023 FAST.
Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 51% on the 2023 FAST.

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50
  percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent
  statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy
or STAR Reading 2023 will increase for grades kindergarten through 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.

1. 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.

Fieg, Catrena, cfieg@ecsdfl.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?

Ferry Pass 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 RtI 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.	Fieg, Catrena, cfieg@ecsdfl.us

Title I Requirements

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

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

Publicized in a timely manner utilizing a variety of formats to best reach all families. Information will be provided in a format and language parents can understand.

School Messenger automated phone service
School Calendar
Newsletter/Flier

email/FOCUS messenger
Marquee/a-frame signs
Website/Social Media

*Webpage: https://www.escambiaschools.org/fpes

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))

Flexible parent meetings will be offered both during the day and evenings and at varying times to accommodate schedules. Activities will be implemented that will build the capacity for meaningful parent/family involvement, and building relationships with the community to improve student academic achievement. These activities include conferences, family nights, and virtual meetings, where assessment data, strategies, and standards are shared and discussed. Training and resources will be provided to help parents support their child's learning at home.

*Webpage: https://www.escambiaschools.org/fpes

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))

1. ELA (49.3%) and Math (50.5%) proficiency on the 2023 FAST will increase to 52% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide.
-Ensure that the teachers have a shared understanding of the curriculum standards across the grades.
-Strengthen the Tier 1 instructional delivery through use of the Math/ELA Frameworks, BIG-M and Florida's B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.
-Use a common planning protocol schoolwide which includes coming prepared to planning, a focus on the benchmarks, and engagement strategies

2. The achievement gap in ELA and Math learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50% (24 points to 12 points).
-Strengthen the multi-tiered system of supports for all students.
-Review assessment data every two weeks and hold data meetings to identify students in need of intervention,
-Determine targeted evidence based interventions for identified students.
-Provide intensive, systematic, explicit, instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening.

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))

Coordinate and integrate parent and family engagement strategies with other Federal, State, and local programs

1. Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK)-Title I Part A co-funds VPK services, by extending full day services in schools with our highest poverty. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy

development activities.

2. Title I, Part C-Migrant families participate in a LEA Advisory Council for English Language Learners. Translators are available for teacher conferences as well as to assist with translation of documents to be provided for families. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy development activities.

3. Title IV, Part A-Provides hygiene items, school supplies, enrollment assistance, social work, and advocacy. Assistance for housing, food, clothing, and other emergency support are available for families referred under Title IX.

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