
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

J. H. Workman Middle School

6299 LANIER DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

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.

J. H. Workman Middle School students will become inquiring, compassionate, lifelong learners. Through a challenging and engaging academic program that encourages international-mindedness, our students will attain a broad and firm foundation of knowledge, cultural understanding, and respect for diversity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through a challenging educational program, J.H. Workman students will become active, compassionate, and lifelong learners who understand other people and their differences.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thomas, Derrick	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional Development for teachers & staff - Lead weekly leadership team meeting-Weekly feedback to ELA, Reading, and special area teachers - School Wide Data Analysis (instructional) - Weekend focus email-Lead Department Chair Meeting - Monthly-Lead Faculty Meeting - Monthly-Support Parent/Teacher Activities - Community Partnerships-School Advisory Council - Member of Threat Assessment Team - Evaluate ELA teachers-8th grade Promotion Ceremony - 6th grade Orientation - Attendance
Burns, Amy	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional Development for teachers & staff - Lead weekly leadership team meeting - Weekly feedback to Math Teachers - School-Wide Data Analysis (instructional) - Weekend focus email - Lead Department Chair Meeting - Monthly- Lead Faculty Meeting - Monthly-Instructional Coach & Guidance - Support Parent/Teacher Activities - Community Partnerships - Works with SRO officers - Assign Duty Stations - Pull & Monitor Math data - Evaluate math department - Member of Threat Assessment Team - 8th grade Promotion Ceremony - 6th grade Orientation - Attendance- Focus Gradebook & Report Cards - Website, Social Media, Call Outs-Title I monitoring
Schultz, Heather	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional Development for teachers & staff - Lead weekly leadership team meeting - Weekly feedback to Science/Civics Teachers - School-Wide Data Analysis (instructional) - Weekend focus email - Lead Department Chair Meeting - Monthly- Lead Faculty Meeting - Monthly-Instructional Coach & Guidance - Support Parent/Teacher Activities - Community Partnerships - Works with SRO officers - Assign Duty Stations

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.

During the spring of 2023, we organized SAC meetings to collect input from parents. Additionally, we held extra staff meetings to gather feedback from teachers who were not part of the SAC committee. The Student Government Association students also shared their input. Their input, concerns, and comments were considered during the creation of 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 school improvement plan will be regularly monitored through various methods such as progress monitoring assessments, data analysis, teacher evaluations, and feedback from students and parents. Regular meetings and check-ins with the school administration and staff will also be conducted to assess the plan's effectiveness and make necessary adjustments if needed. Additionally, periodic reviews of the SIP goals by the administrative team will ensure the plan's successful implementation and achievement of its goals.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: C
	2019-20: D
	2018-19: D
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	37	43	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	78	73	204
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	101	129	315
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	91	65	255
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	86	79	221

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	43	47	40	130

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	3	3	2	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	12

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	89	72	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	93	95	235
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5	6	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	7	9	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	90	107	285
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	104	112	310
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	80	204

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	99	96	264

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	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	9	15

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	89	72	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	93	95	235
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5	6	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	7	9	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	90	107	285
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	104	112	310
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	80	204

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	99	96	264

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	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	9	15

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*	31	40	49	29	42	50	28		
ELA Learning Gains				39			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			32		
Math Achievement*	37	45	56	26	33	36	20		
Math Learning Gains				44			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			30		
Science Achievement*	33	40	49	30	43	53	24		
Social Studies Achievement*	51	59	68	41	50	58	30		
Middle School Acceleration	80	73	73	82	47	49	54		
Graduation Rate					41	49			
College and Career Acceleration					57	70			
ELP Progress	53	39	40	59	79	76	54		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	16	Yes	4	4
ELL	27	Yes	4	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	4	
HSP	40	Yes	2	
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	65			

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%
FRL	45			

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	25	Yes	3	3
ELL	27	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	35	Yes	1	
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	41			

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	31			37			33	51	80			53
SWD	13			14			9	26			4	
ELL	8			28			32	15			5	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			27			21	43	80		5	
HSP	23			44			29	44			5	58
MUL	49			51			46	69			4	

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
PAC												
WHT	53			56			62	78	77		5	
FRL	29			34			30	51	79		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	29	39	34	26	44	50	30	41	82			59
SWD	8	23	22	9	35	38	13	14	62			
ELL	5	29	23	5	43	43	4	35				59
AMI												
ASN	27	45		27	42							
BLK	17	33	37	17	40	50	15	31	87			
HSP	15	33	24	12	39	41	9	40	62			62
MUL	56	65		38	39		64	50	63			
PAC												
WHT	56	50	42	53	56	62	69	64	86			
FRL	26	39	40	23	43	49	22	39	82			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	28	34	32	20	23	30	24	30	54			54
SWD	7	23	29	10	15	22	10	9				
ELL	13	41	48	7	29	35	0	13				54
AMI												
ASN	27	42		27	25							
BLK	18	28	27	9	19	28	12	17	31			
HSP	15	38	52	10	26	43	9	22				55
MUL	38	38		36	31		36	41				
PAC												
WHT	54	45	43	44	30	17	52	62	64			
FRL	22	30	28	12	19	31	15	21	24			64

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	30%	37%	-7%	47%	-17%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	38%	-12%	47%	-21%
06	2023 - Spring	24%	37%	-13%	47%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	24%	41%	-17%	54%	-30%
07	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	48%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	31%	7%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	25%	36%	-11%	44%	-19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	38%	52%	50%	40%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	56%	18%	63%	11%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	66%	-21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The SWD students had an ELA proficiency of 5.7% on the FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessment which is a 41.3% gap compared to the state. The factors that contributed to this gap include inexperienced teachers and the students lack of engagement in the subject matter. Another factor that greatly contributed was the teacher shortage that did allow us to fill two inclusion positions to support our students in these subject matters.

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

The overall data showed the greatest decline in ELL Civic students with a -19.4% decline from the prior year. The factors that contributed to this decline include an increase in population with newcomers in the ELL department that consistently is growing.

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.

According to the data the greatest gap when compared to the state average is in ELA with a gap of -18.7%. The factors that contributed to this gap include inexperienced teachers and the students lack of engagement in the subject matter.

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

The overall data showed the most improvement in Hispanic students in math with a 34.1% increase. A new action that we implemented as a school was the utilization of a math instructional coach.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, the areas of concern include African American students ODRs and Economically Disadvantaged students with five or more absences. In all four quarters, African American student ODRs are at least six percentage points higher than overall ODRs (29%, 34%, 40%, and 37% for AA students; 22%, 26%, 33%, and 28% overall). Our Economically Disadvantaged students' percentage of 5+ absences is higher than overall (23%, 49%, 42%, 50% for Econ Dis; 23%, 45%, 40%, 47% overall).

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

Our priorities for the upcoming school year include Acceleration, ELL, ELA, SWD, and AA

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.

Over the last three years, attendance decreased for Economically Disadvantaged students due to mental health concerns and the impacts of increased poverty/homelessness. This has negatively impacted student academic progress. Our focus is improving attendance for economically disadvantaged students with five or more absences.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Economically disadvantaged students with five or more absences will decrease to 20% or less each quarter.

Monitoring:

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

We will utilize Focus Analytics to monitor attendance for our economically disadvantaged students twice monthly at attendance data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Schultz (hschultz@escambia.k12.fl.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 Dropout in Secondary Schools- Tier 2)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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 2 - Moderate 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 establish school-wide protocols for attendance and monitoring. The protocols will be monitored by data review quarterly. Students will receive feedback about attendance quarterly.

Person Responsible: Derrick Thomas (dthomas3@ecsdfi.us)

By When: This attendance monitoring and student feedback will be provided quarterly.

The guidance team will meet twice a month to review FOCUS attendance data. At these meetings, students missing 5 days of school or more will be identified and referred to the school social worker and/or the Navigator for an attendance child study with follow -up from the guidance department.

Person Responsible: Derrick Thomas (dthomas3@ecsdfi.us)

By When: The guidance team will meet twice monthly and follow up with students on an as-needed basis throughout the school year.

The attendance incentive plan will be implemented school-wide, providing incentives quarterly. Students with 95% attendance will receive incentives quarterly.

Person Responsible: Amy Burns (aburns2@ecsdfi.us)

By When: At the end of each quarter throughout the school year.

Social worker referrals for students and families will be given to the Navigator and followed up on weekly. The Navigator will assist families with barriers affecting student attendance by making home visits to families the school cannot make contact with and working with the families to provide any additional resources needed.

Person Responsible: Derrick Thomas (dthomas3@ecsdfi.us)

By When: School counselors will follow up with the social worker/navigators weekly throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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 PM3 progress monitoring assessment: Students with Disabilities (5.7%), Economically Disadvantaged (26.8%), African American/Black (18.9%), Hispanic (23.8%), Asian (27%), and ELL (7.7%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency* will increase from 28% on the 2023 FAST PM3 progress monitoring assessment to 35% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, Asian, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic students. ELA proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%.

The achievement gap in proficiency* points between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from a 41-point gap on the 2023 FAST PM3 to a 20-point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM 3.

*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 to monitor the goal will be FAST progress monitoring assessments and school-based assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review schoolwide data twice a month. The team will meet with teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities once per month. The literacy coach and resource teacher will review FAST data and classroom data quarterly to work with teachers to adjust instruction and implement small groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Derrick Thomas (dthomas3@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. Teachers provide a language-rich classroom environment by intentionally and regularly using academic vocabulary and supporting students' use of academic vocabulary. Practice Guide: 10 Key Vocabulary Practices (Tier 1)
2. Provide small-group instructional intervention to students struggling in areas of literacy and English language development. Tier 2 Evidence (Practice Guide 19)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to 10 Key Vocabulary Practices, teachers in all grades are responsible for enhancing their classroom environment to support students' vocabulary learning. Unlike reading and math, skills that need to be directly taught, vocabulary growth flourishes in a language-rich environment that provides students with multiple opportunities for hearing and using academic words. Direct instruction of a word's meaning is necessary but not sufficient. Teachers are also intentional about using academic vocabulary regularly and consistently so that students hear words in context.

Additionally, the use of small group instruction supports students who may need additional time and instructional support in various aspects of literacy and/or English language development above and beyond what typical classroom instruction provides.

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 literacy leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss FAST progress monitoring data for the overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from FAST PM and school-based assessments monthly. Teachers will meet with SWD and lower quartile students after each PM assessment. The teachers will discuss students' goals for the following PM assessments. The school will follow up with classroom walks and feedback on a weekly basis. The administration will continue to conduct data analysis with teachers throughout the 23-24 school year.

Person Responsible: Derrick Thomas (dthomas3@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The admin team will provide weekly walkthrough feedback, monthly feedback, and data chats for classroom assessments and feedback/data chats after each PM assessment.

The literacy coach will plan with Gen-Ed teachers, ESE inclusion teachers weekly. The school-based leadership team will utilize a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards. The teachers will utilize a planning template developed by the school and feedback given by the ELA coach. The school will continue the planning process following up with classroom walks and feedback on a weekly basis. The administration will continue to conduct data analysis with teachers throughout the 23-24 school year.

Person Responsible: Derrick Thomas (dthomas3@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The admin team will provide weekly walkthrough feedback, monthly feedback, and data chats for classroom assessments and feedback/data chats after each PM assessment.

Professional Development will be provided on each District Planning day to support the usage academic vocabulary and small-group instruction. PD will be provided by our Literacy Coach, Administrative team, and ESOL department.

Person Responsible: Derrick Thomas (dthomas3@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Professional development will be completed by the end of the school year.

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

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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

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.

This SIP and SWP will be accessible on the school website all year (<https://www.escambiaschools.org/jhwms>). It will be shared at upcoming SAC meetings and Open House. We will keep a hard copy in the office for any parent that requests one.

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))

Stakeholders will have many opportunities to engage and build relationships with the school. We will host open house, orientation for new students, SAC meetings, PTA meetings, and parent/teacher conferences. Additional opportunities for engagement include a "Book Tasting" with the media specialist, two family nights (fall and spring), and Freshmanology. The Family Engagement Plan is listed on the website year-round.

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)

The school plans to utilize the instructional coach to ensure alignment with the ELA BEST standards. Teachers are trained in best practices and standards-based instruction for ELA. Additionally, we will focus on increasing student attendance rates, specifically for our economically disadvantaged students, to improve the time spent learning.

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))

This plan was developed to integrate the following additional resources and programs to serve our students. We utilize a school navigator to assist students and families with resources for housing, clothing, food, and other necessities. We also contract with Children's Home Society to provide licensed mental health counseling for Tier III interventions. All students receive free breakfast and lunch through the school lunch program to ensure students have the necessary nutrition for learning. We will participate in the district's "Stop the Violence Campaign" to reduce violence in our school community. Additionally, we provide CTE courses for 7th and 8th-grade students to prepare students for future endeavors.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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))

Workman provides numerous resources for student mental health and well-being. We have three certified school counselors to serve our students. We utilize a school navigator to assist students and families with resources for housing, clothing, food, and other necessities. We also contract with Children's Home Society to provide licensed mental health counseling for Tier III interventions. We contract with Pensacola State College and the TRIO program to provide tutoring and mentorship programs for students. Many of our students participate in mentorship through the Take Stock in Children program.

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))

Our 7th and 8th grade students are provided opportunities to take CTE courses to prepare them for future endeavors. They work towards CAPE and industry certifications that will take them through high school and beyond. Additionally, we partner with our feeder high school to provide students opportunities to accelerate in middle school through high school algebra and biology courses, which will then provide opportunities in high school to earn postsecondary credit.

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).

The use of Response to Intervention (RTi) and Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) system is implemented school wide to address behaviors and respond accordingly to those students exhibiting behavior. Students have access to a variety of supports throughout the school day including but not limited to the school counselor, dean and behavior coach.

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))

Teachers, paraprofessionals and school personnel participate in district led inservice during before and during the school year. In addition, professional learning is conducted throughout the year at faculty meetings and department meetings. A partnership with SREB provides additional feedback to specific teachers to improve instruction in the classroom. We continue to strive for a positive culture to retain teachers.

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

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes