Kingsfield Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Kingsfield Elementary School

900 W KINGSFIELD RD, 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.

Kingsfield Elementary is a place where all students are encouraged to strive for excellence academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Our goal is to work with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their full potential through personalized learning. We set high expectations for all students. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reaching the hearts and minds of every student every day.

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
Evans, Quinn	Principal	
Cowart, Maureen	Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Shelnut, Stacey	Other	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/Rti components. Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collections, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Venable, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide inofrmation about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliever Tier 1 instruction/intevention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materias/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Eggart, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/II activities.
Kerkela, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/II activities.
Keegan, Marina	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/II activities.
Ortiz, Regina	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/II activities.
Mills, Becky	Instructional Media	Provide reading data on all students and collaborate with teachers regarding progress and library lesson needed to support student growth.

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 process of involving the stakeholders is to discuss all the areas of focus and strategies planned for those areas. Input from school leadership team and the School Advisory Council is used to make edits and/or additions to strategies and action steps.

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 leadership team will meet once a month to look at all data points to determine if progress is being made to close the achievement gap with our SWD. In addition, after each progress monitoring assessment we will discuss the effectiveness of our strategies in alignment with progress monitoring as needed. If needed the plan will be revised to reflect changes made throughout the year. The School Advisory Council will also participate in data discussions and strategies.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: 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	10	35	30	33	28	24	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	7	4	3	0	0	0	19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	9	4	1	1	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	3	5	4	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	13	18	9	3	6	0	0	0	50

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	7	3	2	2	0	0	0	17

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	5	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5

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	11	21	26	19	15	18	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	1	6	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	20	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	17	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	7	7	6	5	8	0	0	0	37

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	2	3	2	4	12	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	11	21	26	19	15	18	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	1	6	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	20	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	17	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	7	7	6	5	8	0	0	0	37

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	2	3	2	4	12	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	6	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	48	53	62	51	56	58		
ELA Learning Gains				57			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			43		
Math Achievement*	61	50	59	62	46	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				56			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			24		
Science Achievement*	61	52	54	68	52	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		62	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	248
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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	83			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	66			

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	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	52			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	63			61			61					
SWD	30			41			35				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	75			75							2	
BLK	40			31			43				4	
HSP	86			71							3	
MUL	53			44			53				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	66			67			65				4	
FRL	57			51			56				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	62	57	36	62	56	42	68					
SWD	30	39	27	37	31	14	48					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	52	38	31	47	50	47					
HSP	53			50								
MUL	61	52		57	52		40					
PAC												
WHT	68	60	39	70	58	39	78					
FRL	54	56	38	47	46	39	56					

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	58	61	43	60	48	24	72					
SWD	25	53	58	25	5	0	26					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	29		28	14		38					
HSP	44			50			50					
MUL	61			67								
PAC												
WHT	64	70	80	67	58	31	82					
FRL	50	49	36	44	33	21	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
05	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	44%	17%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	51%	15%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	58%	16%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	47%	1%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	51%	9%	51%	9%

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.

Based on available school grade data and progress monitoring data, the data component demonstrating the lowest performance was ELA proficiency with the subgroup of students with disabilities. The ESSA subgroup of SWD fell below 41%. The subgroup of SWD was at 30.5% proficient in ELA. 2021-22 proficiency was 26.8%. This was a small gain of 3.7% from the previous year. Math proficiency for SWD was 42.4%, which was an increase of 7.4% from the previous year. Science proficiency for SWD decreased from 45% to 40%. SWD has always been Kingsfield's lowest performing group in ELA and Math. There has also been a consistent turnover of our ESE resource teachers over the course of the school's history. These are areas of focus for the 2023-2024 school year to specifically enhance the instructional time and strategies for our SWD.

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 was the subject of Science. Overall proficiency dropped from 68% to 62.1%. This was a decline of 5.9%. ESSA subgroups decreasing from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year in Science were our white subgroup and our students with disabilities. Our white subgroup decreased from 77.6% to 65.4%, reflecting a decline of 12.2%. In some classrooms, Tier 1 instruction was a struggle and there was a high rate of absenteeism for one 5th grade teacher that contributed to the decline. Five of the six 5th grade teacher were either new to 5th grade or had only taught 5th for one year.

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 with the greatest gap compared to the state average was the subject of Math for 5th grade. The state average for Math for 5th grade was 55%. Kingsfield 5th graders were 50.4% proficient. There is a negative gap of 4.6%. Historically, 5th grade has been our lowest performing grade in ELA and Math. One of the factors that contributed to the gap was the time the ESE resource teacher spent serving her 5th grade students. Another factor was tier 1 instruction in two classrooms and absences for another 5th grade teacher.

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 was the subject of Math. There was an increase from 62% to 64.2% from the previous school year. Within that component our Hispanic subgroup increased by 21.4%, however this subgroup is only 7% of our 404 students that were tested. Our SWD subgroup increased in Math from 34.5% to 42.4% reflecting a 7.8% change. Our school purchased Reflex Math for students to practice Math fluency. This program was utilized and helped benefit all students in grades 2nd-5th.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data, the biggest areas of concern are tardies and absences. There was a total of 11,056 absences for the 2022-2023 school year. There was a total of 5,923 tardies during the 2022-2023 school year. Students must be in attendance to receive Tier 1 instruction.

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

1. To restructure scheduling and services provided by ESE Resource Teachers and Teacher Assistant Specials
2. Provide support/modeling for small group ELA and Math instruction
3. More rewards for student attendance

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.

After analyzing EWS (PMDR) data for the 2023 school year attendance is a concern that is hindering student achievement in all subjects. Students must be in attendance for learning to occur. For the 2023-2024 school year there were 11,056 absences and 5,923 tardies.

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

Kingsfield Elementary would like to decrease absences by 20% (2,211) and decrease tardies by 20% (1,185) according to our EWS (PMDR) data.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored using our FOCUS Student Information Systems attendance reports and be shared with all stakeholders monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Quinn Evans (qevans@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.)

According to "A randomized experiment using absenteeism information to "nudge" attendance". This randomized controlled trial, conducted in collaboration with the School District of Philadelphia, finds that a single postcard that encouraged guardians to improve their student's attendance reduced absences by roughly 2.4 percent. Guardians received one of two types of message: one encouraging guardians to improve their student's attendance or one encouraging guardians to improve their student's attendance that also included specific information about the student's attendance history. There was no statistically significant difference in absences between students according to which message their guardians received. The effect of the postcard did not differ between students in grades 1–8 and students in grades 9–12.

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

According the "A randomized experiment using absenteeism information to "nudge"attendance, Guardians received one of two types of message: one encouraging guardians to improve their student's attendance or one encouraging guardians to improve their student's attendance that also included specific information about the student's attendance history. There was no statistically significant difference in absences between students according to which message their guardians received. The effect of the postcard did not differ between students in grades 1–8 and students in grades 9–12.

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

The leadership team will analyze PMDR data. The team will meet with teachers at the beginning of the year to discuss absences, students with a history of chronic absenteeism and achievement data of these students. data directly tied to student disabilities pertaining to data. The school social worker will also be utilized to contact families to determine if there are needs or assistance that she can help with.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The team will meet monthly with teachers to discuss data to inform next steps.

The leadership team will establish school-wide 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 and via our morning news show.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The team will then meet monthly with teachers to discuss data to inform next steps.

An attendance paw plaque will be hung weekly outside the classroom in each grade level with the highest attendance rate. Monthly the class with the highest attendance rate on each grade level will receive a treat.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This plague will be placed above classroom doors on a weekly basis. The treat will be given out on a monthly basis.

Each teacher will make at least one positive call home to two students within their class per week The teacher will log these calls in each student's FOCUS panel.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly FOCUS call log reports

Guidance counselors will monitor attendance and conduct child study attendance team meetings throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Maureen Cowart (mcowart@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Quarterly

#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.

In analyzing 2023-2023 FAST ELA data, only 30.5% of our ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities were proficient in ELA. This was a 3.7% increase from the previous year, but still well below the federal index.

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

Students in the ESSA subgroup of SWD will increase ELA proficiency on FAST by 15 percentage points, bringing proficiency above the federal index.

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

Data from FAST for grades 3-5 and STAR data for grades KG-2 will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed after each progress monitoring period. Administration and the RTi Coordinator will meet with teachers for data review after each progress monitoring period to make changes to small group instruction based on the needs of the students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Quinn Evans (qevans@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 match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit, and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

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

According to High Leverage Practices in Special Education Tier 3 intensive instruction is highly individualized for students with severe and persistent learning needs who, according to data, have not responded to evidence-based core instruction and supplemental intervention. Teachers incorporate evidence-based
practices that have been proven effective for students with disabilities across all content areas including math, reading, writing and behavior. Intensive instruction integrates cognitive processing strategies; is explicit; integrates opportunities for feedback; and is responsive to student performance data (Baker, Gersten, & Lee, 2002; Santangelo, Harris, & Graham, 2007). Instruction is delivered to a small number of students (no more than three) with similar learning or behavioral needs (WWC, 2009a). Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit, and wellpaced instruction to address skill gaps.

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.

Meet with Florida Inclusion Network to create a master schedule that maximizes human resources to provide the intensive reading interventions required for students in need.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: ASAP given the availability of the FIN network.

Conduct monthly data chats with teachers identifying progress of SWD on summative and formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

Teachers conduct data chats with SWD to develop goals and discuss progress with SWD.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Every four weeks.

Meet with teachers providing small group instruction to make sure that it meets the following: more time in small groups targeted at the right level, more detailed instruction, more sequenced, more guided and precise practice--errorless instruction more corrective feedback. Support will be provided to teachers from the STAR 360 rep on small group differentiated based on BEST standards and student test data.

Person Responsible: Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Throughout the year

#3. 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.

One area of focus is to increase ELA proficiency.

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

ELA proficiency will increase by 6 percentage points from 64% to 70% on ELA FAST for grades 3-5.

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

ELA proficiency will be monitored after each progress monitoring period for FAST. Administration will meet with teachers following each assessment for data meetings to determine students in need of evidence based interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maureen Cowart (mcowart@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. Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
2. Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly.
3. Routinely use a set of comprehension building practices to help students make sense of the text.
4. Provide students with opportunities to practice making sense of stretch text (i.e., challenging text) that will expose them to complex ideas and information.

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

This practice guide, developed by the What Works Clearinghouse™ (WWC) in conjunction with an expert panel, distills this contemporary research into easily comprehensible and practical recommendations for educators to use when providing reading interventions. The recommendations outline evidence-based practices that can help teachers meet the needs of their students with reading difficulties. These recommendations will also help educators address the requirements of two federal laws, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that favor the use of evidence-based instructional practices relevant to student needs. This summary introduces the four recommendations and supporting evidence described in the full practice guide.

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.

FAST ELA data and schoolnet assessments will be analyzed to determine groups of students that are within 15 points (plus or minus) of a level 3 on FAST ELA. A 17 and a half hour tutor (a retired teacher) has been hired to work with these small groups of students on comprehension skills.

Person Responsible: Maureen Cowart (mcowart@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The tutor will work 4 days per week with 4th and 5th grade groups. Data will be analyzed after each schoolnet test and FAST assessment.

Teachers will differentiate small group instruction based on results of the FAST each progress monitoring period.

Person Responsible: Maureen Cowart (mcowart@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Quarterly and after each progress monitoring period.

Administration will have data meetings with teachers after FAST progress monitoring periods and individual meetings during the 3rd quarter.

Person Responsible: Maureen Cowart (mcowart@ecsdfl.us)

By When: After each PM period and during the 3rd quarter.

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)).

A tutor will be hired specifically to work with 4th and 5th that fall in the lower quartile according to FAST ELA and Math. This tutor will be funded through SAI monies.