

Escambia County School District

Jim Allen Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Jim Allen Elementary School

1051 N HIGHWAY 95A, Cantonment, FL 32533

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 Jim Allen Elementary is to ensure that every student has the self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible, contributing, and satisfied life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the goal of Jim Allen School to prepare each child who enters here to function effectively and responsibly in a challenging society by providing learning experiences appropriate to individual needs, interests, aspirations, abilities, and creative potential. We believe that to achieve, to succeed and to accomplish are important goals but not at the expense of the human values that make a community a place that sustains all its members. We therefore strive not only to maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere in which each child can develop into his/her highest potential but also to instill a sense of discipline and responsibility toward self, family, school, community and country.

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
Cross, Shannon	Principal	
Gilmore, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	
Helton, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Hoffman, Robyn	Teacher, K-12	
Massey, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Sherbrook, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Sexton, Gregory	Teacher, K-12	
Cooley, Rachel	Teacher, ESE	
Cooks, Brianna	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Large, Angela	School Counselor	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Improvement Plan is developed by the school leadership team. While developing the plan, the team considers input from parents, teachers, and staff that was collected over the course of the

school year during School Advisory Council meetings, behavior/safety team meetings, literacy leadership team meetings, parent and faculty surveys, and event evaluations.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards through bi-weekly data meetings that include teachers and the administrative staff to evaluate and discuss ongoing progress. Extended data meetings will also be held following statewide progress monitoring assessments. This data will be shared with the faculty and staff along with the School Advisory Council and PTA. Teacher and student-specific data will also be collected during daily walkthroughs, formal observations, unit assessments, and quarterly assessments. This data will be monitored by the leadership team in order to see if our SIP is being properly implemented, if any changes need to be made, and if it is being impactful on student achievement.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	14	41	34	27	17	25	0	0	0	158	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	6	8	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	7	5	6	2	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	1	3	9	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	10	27	18	28	17	25	0	0	0	125	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	35	14	17	37	29	31	0	0	0	163	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	11	9	4	3	10	0	0	0	38	
	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	4	5	4	3	9	0	0	0	25

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	1	9	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	15	34	21	28	29	24	0	0	0	151	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	8	4	2	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	2	6	3	2	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	3	5	4	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	21	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	24	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	27	17	27	26	25	26	0	0	0	148	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	3	1	10	9	12	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	15	34	21	28	29	24	0	0	0	151	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	8	4	2	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	2	6	3	2	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	3	5	4	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	21	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	24	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	27	17	27	26	25	26	0	0	0	148	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	3	1	10	9	12	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	48	48	53	57	51	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				59			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			50		
Math Achievement*	49	50	59	62	46	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				70			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			65		
Science Achievement*	55	52	54	61	52	59	54		
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	194
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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	2	1
HSP	62			
MUL	48			
PAC				

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%
WHT	53			
FRL	43			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	73			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	54			

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	48			49			55					
SWD	20			28			26				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			29			32				4	
HSP	65			59							2	

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
MUL	42			53							2	
PAC												
WHT	51			52			62				4	
FRL	43			40			51				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	57	59	45	62	70	59	61					
SWD	29	31	15	31	53	53	28					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	40	21	43	48	36	35					
HSP	64			82								
MUL	62			57								
PAC												
WHT	61	64	62	66	73	62	68					
FRL	51	53	43	54	64	52	63					

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	53	44	50	54	71	65	54					
SWD	20	31	50	29	75	70	27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	38		36	77		23					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	45	55	58	69	70	61					

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
FRL	49	45	40	46	67	64	40					

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	50%	49%	1%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	44%	-5%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	51%	-13%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	47%	10%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	51%	4%	51%	4%

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 students with disabilities subgroup showed the lowest performance. The SWD subgroup was 20% proficient for 22-23 school year. Contributing factors that lead to this low performance include a master schedule generated that was not supportive of the inclusion setting. This schedule resulted in limited time with the ESE resource teacher and caused lower-performing students to miss core instruction. Students were not participating in Tier 1 instruction for the same amount of time as their peers without disabilities. It has been a trend at Jim Allen for SWD to be the lowest-performing group for several years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline in ELA from the previous year was multi-racial students with a -14.5% decline. The data component that showed the greatest decline in math from the previous year was Hispanic students with a -23% decline. It is possible that scheduling is an attributing factor to the decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in Math. Overall, our school proficiency was 6.9 points below the state average of 57.2%. Significantly, the third grade level of proficiency was 21.6 points below the state average of 59.5%. This gap might be attributed to a lack of spiral review of standards in the math block. Students were not practicing skills or reviewing previously taught standards throughout the year. Also, many students struggled with fluency in math facts, which hindered their application of more difficult math strategies. Another possible contributing factor to the decline is that the 22-23 state assessment was computer-based which has proven to be more challenging for our students when compared to paper-based assessments.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement in ELA was Hispanic students with a 1.1% increase. No data component showed improvement in Math, however, the subgroup SWD only decreased .2%.

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

Attendance in Q2 and Q4 is a concern as absences and tardies increased significantly during those quarters. The increase in absences rose from 19.09% in Q1 to 43.96% in Q2 and 24.18% in Q3 to 31.3% in Q4.

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

The first priority is to increase the federal index for SWD. It is currently 29.4% which is below the 32% threshold and significantly below the 41% goal.

The second priority is to increase the federal index for black students. It is currently 31.5% which is below the 41% goal and the 32% threshold.

Our third priority, which will be inclusive of the first two, is to increase learning gains for our lowest quartile students in both reading and mathematics.

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.

During the 2022 - 2023 school year, the percentage of students absent for 5 or more days during one quarter increased throughout the school year starting at 19.09% in Q1, 43.96% in Q2, 24.18% in Q3, and 31.31% in Q3. Chronic absenteeism has a negative effect on school culture and student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will reduce the number of students who are absent more than five days within a quarter to less than 15%.

Monitoring:

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

Individual student attendance will be monitored weekly through Focus. The leadership will establish schoolwide protocols for attendance. The protocols will be monitored by data review and class walks. Teachers and students will receive feedback about attendance on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfi.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.)

An attendance committee consisting of the principal, assistant principal, curriculum coordinator, and guidance counselor will meet to evaluate student attendance. The committee will develop attendance expectations for students and staff, along with incentives to improve attendance using positive reinforcement. Leadership will promote the importance of attendance to all stakeholders. Professional development in building a school culture supportive of consistent attendance will be presented in accordance Attendance Works strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Attendance Works, "Cultivating a culture of school-wide attendance reduces chronic school absenteeism." Reducing chronic absenteeism will improve school culture and student achievement.

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.

Create attendance committee

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfi.us)

By When: August 2023

Meet and develop expectations for staff and students

Person Responsible: Angela Large (alarge@ecsdfi.us)

By When: August 2023

Communicate expectations with faculty, staff, students, and families

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Before the end of August 2023 and ongoing

Create incentives to promote attendance

Person Responsible: Angela Large (alarge@ecsdfi.us)

By When: September 2023

Monitor progress and data

Person Responsible: Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Monthly September 2023 - May 2024

Communicate with teachers, students, parents/guardians

Person Responsible: Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Monthly September 2023 - May 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

At Jim Allen, the Federal Index for students with disabilities has consistently been below 41%. For the 22-23 school year, the predicted Federal Index for SWD is 25%. For the 21-22 school year, it was 34%. It was also 34% for the 2018-2019 school year, and it was 31% for the 2017-2018 school year. This indicates that students with disabilities have been underperforming when compared with their same-aged peers at Jim Allen.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Federal Index for students with disabilities will increase by at least 12.4 percentage points from 29.4% to at least 41%.

Monitoring:

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the SWD goal will be module tests, end-of-unit tests, quarterly progress monitoring, and FAST 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 schoolwide data twice a month in data meetings. During the bi-weekly data meetings, teachers will be present to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@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 utilize inclusive collaborative teaching strategies to increase student achievement. This collaboration between general education teachers, special education teachers, resource teachers, and educational support staff will provide students with intensive, differentiated instruction targeted toward meeting student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Sim Learning Strategies, "Using the Collaborative Problem-Solving program, special education and general education teachers can communicate with one another, solve problems, make decisions, and create plans to help students like John succeed in inclusive classrooms." According to the National Center for Learning Disabilities, "Collaboration is an effective tool that allows general educators, special educators, learning specialists, administrators, and other stakeholders to work together to meet the needs of students. Collaboration is particularly important to sustain inclusive settings. No single educator should be responsible for holding the expertise in the infinite presentations of learner variability. Further, students work with multiple adults within a school building. Collaboration creates safe conditions for students and educators to share knowledge and collectively problem-solve.

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.

Create schedules for grade levels, general education teachers, special education teachers, and educational support staff conducive to collaborative planning and teaching

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfi.us)

By When: August 2023

Provide collaborative teaching professional development to teachers and support staff.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@ecsdfi.us)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing

Teachers will utilize appropriate interventions based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Brianna Cooks (bcooks@ecsdfi.us)

By When: September 2023 and ongoing

Monitor data at bi-weekly data meetings

Person Responsible: Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@ecsdfi.us)

By When: September 2023 and ongoing

Collaborate with grade level and administrative team to discuss data and make instructional changes.

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfi.us)

By When: September 2023 and ongoing

#3. 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.

Data from state assessments indicate that two subgroups of students at Jim Allen are performing below the performance level of their peers and the minimum federal index, students with disabilities and black students. In addition, predicted state assessment data shows low performance in learning gains for all students and for those students in the lowest quartile in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. Increasing learning gains will improve student achievement across the board. A focus on collaborative standards-based planning will improve instruction for all students, improving the performance of both subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student learning gains in English Language Arts and Mathematics will increase for all students and those in the lowest quartile to at least 50%. The Federal Index for black students will increase to 41% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will participate in collaborative planning once weekly during common planning time and an extra ninety minutes of planning bi-weekly with a focus on planning for data-driven instruction. A member of the administrative team will meet with each grade-level team bi-weekly to monitor data analysis, instructional planning, and decisions driven by summative and formative student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Cross (scross@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.)

The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk states that "all students can learn if: 1. 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 and 2. Decisions are based on student data. Data are collected efficiently by using a data-management system and focus on factors known to predict later achievement or behavior problems...This information then leads to research-based interventions." Collaborative Planning allows teams of educators to plan for and deliver quality instruction and monitor student progress using data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Allowing educators to work collectively in planning for instruction will focus their attention on determining what students need to know (standards), how students will demonstrate learning (assessment), what will be done if students are not successful (interventions), and how we respond when students demonstrate proficiency (enrichment.) Collaborative planning will improve instruction for all students, allowing teachers to focus directly on student needs while combining their talents.

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.

Create a master schedule that allows for common planning.

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023

Provide funding for additional collaborative planning after contract hours.

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023

Schedule planning sessions for grade level and leadership teams.

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023

Provide teachers and support staff with professional development in collaborative planning including a framework for planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: September 2023

The administration will attend and monitor collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing

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's 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:

23% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

27% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

27% 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 61% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 38% 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% on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

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

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

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cross, Shannon, scross@ecsdf.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Jim Allen 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
<p>Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-</p> <p>Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.</p> <p>Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.</p> <p>Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.</p> <p>Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.</p> <p>Action Step 3: Assessment</p> <p>Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Action Step 4: Professional Learning -</p> <p>We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:</p> <p>Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees</p> <p>Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading.</p>	<p>Cross, Shannon, scross@ecsdfl.us</p>

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.

The Title I Annual Meeting is held during the first quarter of the school year. All stakeholders (families, teachers, staff, and community members) are invited to attend. During this meeting the following information is shared: School Improvement Plan, Parent & Family Engagement Plan, Title I Budget, Parents' Right to Know (defined by Title I law), and the School-Family Compact.

Throughout the school year, SIP progress is regularly shared and discussed through the School Advisory Council. Regardless of membership status, all stakeholders are invited to attend School Advisory Council meetings.

Links to the school's SIP are posted on the school's homepage as well as the school's Our Title I Family page.

<https://www.escambiaschools.org/jaes>

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))

During the 23-24 school year, parent conferences will be held by all teachers to share the progress of each student. FAST data will be reviewed with families. One academic Family Night is scheduled to build the capacity of families in Language Arts and Math. One STEM Family night is scheduled to build the capacity of families in Math and Science. Teachers will share strategies that can be used at home.

Monthly school newsletters will include calendar information, school updates, and suggestions for home learning activities that promote academics and social-emotional skills. Teachers will provide newsletters to explain to parents how to reinforce the lessons being taught at school. Teachers and staff will meet with parents during IEP and RtI meetings to ensure student success.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is shared with families during the Title I Annual Meeting, posted on our website, and messaged to families through the student information system FOCUS.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is accessible from our school's website.

<https://www.escambiaschools.org/jaes>

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 strengthen the academic program in the school by focusing on improving student achievement for students with disabilities and improving the learning gains of all students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. The master schedule was created to maximize instructional time and support for an inclusive classroom. Teachers will participate in book studies to increase performance and student achievement. Collaborative planning will occur to maximize the effectiveness of instruction.

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))

Title I Part A co-funds Voluntary Pre-K services, by extending full-day services in schools with our highest poverty. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy development activities.

ESOL Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) such as translation services and paraprofessionals.

Title IV Part A provides students with a well-rounded education, supports safe and healthy students, and supports the effective use of technology.

Title IX 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.

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.

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))

Students at risk, especially those with academic and emotional needs, are provided with access to counseling, school-based mental health services, mentoring, and peer groups designed to improve their overall success in life.

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).

All students who struggle with either academics or behavior are entered into a multi-tiered system of support in order to address their individual needs. This process is closely monitored by teachers, families, and school leadership.

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 and staff will participate in professional learning communities with a focus on either reading intervention strategies, difficult behaviors, small group reading instruction, or joy in teaching. Each staff member will be given the opportunity to select a learning community based on their personal need for growth.

Professional development will be provided to all teachers and support staff on collaborative teaching and inclusive instruction.

Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development in data collection, learning management systems, and instructional and assessment platforms including FAST, iReady, Star 360, and Canvas. Teachers will be given time and a framework for collaborative planning including BEST standards and intervention strategies.

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))

In order to assist preschool children with the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs, parents are given information including strategies to make transitions smoother and help them work with their children at parent/teacher conferences, in newsletters, and at school events. Teachers also share VPK assessment results with parents after each administration so that parents know their student's progress and where they fall in the expectation of being Kindergarten Ready.

Staff are provided with training opportunities online, at the individual schools, and at the district level. Training topics include procedural information, required parent involvement elements, curriculum & instruction, standards, safety, best practices, using assessments, and behavior.