Hellen Caro Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hellen Caro Elementary School

12551 MEADSON RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Hellen Caro Elementary is to create a learning environment that provides every student with the skills necessary to ensure success for their future education through a partnership among parents, school staff, teachers and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Hellen Caro Elementary School is to create an environment where students want to learn, faculty and staff want to work, and parents want to send their children to school.

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
Roby, Amy	Principal	Instructional and organizational leader.
Duvall, Julie	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader.
Bell, Saundra	School Counselor	Support of students; conduct, mental health, academics
Choron, Denise	School Counselor	Support of students; conduct, mental health, academics
Walker, Julie	Other	RTI Coordinator; Support of teachers with RTI process, strategies and documentation

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Data is shared with the School Advisory Council and input is gathered to meet student needs and increase student achievement. Administration works with teachers and staff to analyze data trends and develop plans to make improvements. The community partners are made aware of needs and respond accordingly.

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 administration will monitor implementation and student achievement throughout the year. Progress monitoring data and walk-through data will be used. The plan will be reflected upon and adapted to meet the instructional needs of students throughout the year.

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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	40	12	18	16	10	13	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	13	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	3	15	18	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	3	3	3	5	0	0	0	16

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	1	1	2	8	6	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	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	40	12	18	16	10	13	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	13	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	3	15	18	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	3	3	3	5	0	0	0	16

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	1	1	2	8	6	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	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*	58	48	53	66	51	56	72		
ELA Learning Gains				61			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			45		
Math Achievement*	64	50	59	70	46	50	69		
Math Learning Gains				71			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			63		
Science Achievement*	63	52	54	71	52	59	70		
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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
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	34	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	60			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	52			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	67			

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	70			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	53			

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	58			64			63					
SWD	27			36			38				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			38							2	
HSP	54			60			55				4	
MUL	68			73			54				4	
PAC												
WHT	60			66			67				4	
FRL	51			53			59				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	66	61	45	70	71	48	71					
SWD	24	39	38	36	50	35	36					
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	38	47		39	53							
HSP	63	52		69	76		75					
MUL	71	63		74	67		75					
PAC												
WHT	69	63	33	72	73	53	73					
FRL	57	57	52	59	58	35	50					

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	72	69	45	69	70	63	70					
SWD	37	40		37			27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			54								
HSP	82	82		77	90		77					
MUL	69	58		74	67		73					
PAC												
WHT	73	74	50	69	74	75	71					
FRL	60	51	38	57	65	50	56					

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	56%	49%	7%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	51%	10%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	47%	15%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	51%	10%	51%	10%

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.

Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance with only 32% proficient in ELA, 40% proficient in Math and 36% in Science.
Data indicates that this subgroup has been a low performing group for many years.

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

Overall Science proficiency declined 8%. Quarterly progress monitoring assessments showed much higher proficiency rate throughout the year. The decline was unexpected and could be attributed to situational testing issues. Reading proficiency for this group of students is 56%. This could have also contributed to the decline in science proficiency because of the amount of reading on the assessment.

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.

All areas were above the state average.
ELA is 8.4% above.
Math is 9.7% above.
Science is 10.7% above.

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

All data components declined in overall proficiency.
Math proficiency was the least decline at 2.3%
We added Frax and Reflex (fluency for math and fractions).

SWD in ELA increased 7.5%
Teachers used Sonday System to close gaps with foundational skills. iReady and the ECPS Reading Decision Tree was used to target instruction.

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

Absences in 5th grade are a concern. Of the 109 students, 32 had 5 or more absences in Quarter 4. School-wide there were 3,814 tardies during the year.

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

Our highest priority will be in improvement of the Federal Index for the subgroup, SWD.

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.

Attendance and tardies are two areas of concern. School-wide there were 8,109 absences and 3,814 tardies. The average daily attendance was 92.9%
The sub-group, SWD, had 1,320 absences and 658 tardies.

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

The average daily attendance school-wide will increase by 2%.

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the attendance goal will be FOCUS. Attendance will be monitored weekly by the admin team. The administration will develop a school wide culture of attendance from the beginning of the year by placing emphasis on daily attendance and providing information to families and teachers. Good attendance will be rewarded monthly with the classrooms per grade level having the highest average daily attendance. Weekly attendance will be posted (by grade level) in the staff newsletter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Duvall (jduvall@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.)

To conceptualize this, it is first necessary to describe the negative individual academic and behavioral ramifications of those students missing great amounts of school time. Academically, it has been established that highly absent students receive fewer hours of instruction and are consequently more likely to require
significant remediation when returning to school (Chen & Stevenson, 1995; Connell, Spencer, & Aber, 1994; Finn, 1993). Behaviorally, it has also been established that absenteeism causes Gottfried, in press at Urban Education 5 students to feel a greater sense of alienation from their classmates, teachers, and schools and may have larger frequencies of negative interactions and social disengagement when returning to school (Ekstron, Goertz, Pollack, & Rock, 1986; Finn, 1989; Gottfried, 2014; Johnson, 2005;
Newmann, 1981). In tandem, these negative individual-level academic and behavioral consequences have the potential to spillover on the outcomes of other students.

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

According to Attendance Works:
Every day a student is absent is a lost opportunity for learning. Too many absences not only can affect achievement for the absent student but also can disrupt learning for the entire class. Attendance improves when a school community offers a warm and welcoming environment that emphasizes building relationships with families and stresses the importance of going to class every day. The key is developing a school-wide school culture where students feel connected and know that someone notices, in a caring manner, when they missed school. A key component of the engagement is helping families understand the negative effects of chronic absenteeism on realizing their hopes and dreams for their children. Many

parents do not realize that just missing two days each month can be a problem, and often leads to falling behind in the classroom.

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.

Prepare information for families about the importance of daily school attendance and the adverse effects of absenteeism. Develop a system for monitoring and analyzing attendance data. Track data weekly and intervene as needed. Create a reward system for classrooms with a high rate of daily attendance.

Person Responsible: Julie Duvall (jduvall@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Data will be tracked weekly beginning in September. Information for families will be included at Open House and in the office lobby. Monthly reward system will begin in September.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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.

When comparing 2021-2022 FSA data in Language Arts, Math and Science to 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 data, proficiency declined in all areas. Language Arts proficiency decreased from 66% to 62.4% (-3.6%), Math proficiency decreased from 70% to 67% (-3%), and Science proficiency decreased 71% to 63% (-8%). According to the ESSA Federal Index, students with disabilities at Hellen Caro are performing at 37%, which is below the federal requirement of 41%. FAST PM 3 data indicates that while the SWD subgroup increased in proficiency in ELA from 25% to 32.1% and in Math from 35% to 39.6%, there is a distinct achievement gap for these students when compared to the general student population. In Science, the SWD declined in proficiency from 38% to 36.4% which continues to indicate a significant achievement gap.

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

ELA proficiency will go from 66% proficiency* on the 2023 FAST PM3 to 70% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3. Math proficiency will increase from 67% to 72%. Science proficiency will increase from 63% to 75%. The achievement gap in ELA proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 30.3 point gap on the 2022 ELA FAST to a 15 point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3. The achievement gap in math proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 27.4 point gap on the 2022 Math FAST to a 14 point gap or less on the 2024 Math FAST PM3. The achievement gap in Science proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 27 point gap on the 2022 Science FSA to a 14 point gap or less on the 2024 Science FSA.

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, district quarterly assessments, and school-based assessments. The admin team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning and collaboration between teachers. The admin team will also review school wide data once 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:
Amy Roby (aroby@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.)

Teachers will have common planning time at least 3 times a week. This will provide opportunities for targeted collaboration between ESE and Gen Ed teachers. Collaboration activities will be focused on
a. designing each student's instructional program to meet clearly specified outcomes
b. collecting data and monitoring progress toward these outcomes.
Effective and purposeful collaboration should enlist support from district and school leaders, who can foster
a collective commitment to collaboration, provide professional learning experiences to increase team members' collaborative skills, and create schedules that support different forms of ongoing collaboration

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

According to High-Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities, Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals, and support staff is necessary to support students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings (e.g., co-taught). Collaboration with individuals or teams requires the use of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data, and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities, and resources to maximize student 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.

ESE and Gen Ed teachers will meet weekly to collaborate on instruction, student achievement, and data analysis. These collaborative sessions will focus on individual students and will result in aligned instructional practices to specifically meet the needs of SWD.

Person Responsible: Amy Roby (aroby@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Collaboration activity will be monitored monthly. Teachers will share notes from the sessions with the admin team.

Increase teacher knowledge on use of assessment data to drive instruction for mathematics.
The leadership team will meet with teachers to share schoolwide data.
Develop a system to provide and monitor data chats with students before the next assessment.

Person Responsible: Amy Roby (aroby@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Data will be shared with teacher prior to PM2 and then again before PM3.

Teachers will utilize overt direct instruction, including ESE inclusion services, to increase student engagement in science instruction.
A Teachers will utilize specific engagement strategies such as "cold call", "turn and talk", and "calling on all students" to increase classroom engagement.
A Teachers will incorporate labs and/or hands on activities at least biweekly into the curriculum. .

Person Responsible: Julie Duvall (jduvall@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly or biweekly labs and hands-on activities will be incorporated by the second nine weeks.

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.

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

<div style="background-color:#aac4e8">

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

</div>

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

<div style="background-color:#aac4e8">

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

</div>

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: Collaborative Planning	$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