

Escambia County School District

L. D. Mcarthur 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	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

L. D. Mcarthur Elementary School

330 E TEN MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

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 McArthur Elementary School is to have parents and staff working together to facilitate a safe learning environment where all children are valued as they are provided tools for successful citizenship and the foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We, the faculty and staff of McArthur Elementary, believe that all children are important. Our goal is to build an environment that encourages the learning and development of the individual student in all phases of academic, physical, creative and emotional experiences by providing a positive classroom climate.

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
Magee, Holly	Principal	Instructional leader for teachers, manage the daily school processes and management of facility.
Harris, Angie	Assistant Principal	
Shaw, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Stephenson, Megan	Behavior Specialist	
Penton, Becky	Teacher, K-12	
Higgins, Carmen	Teacher, K-12	
Matrone, Tiffanie	School Counselor	
Bechtol, Dawn	Teacher, ESE	

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 leadership team will be involved in the creation of the School improvement plan. This information will be shared with each grade level team before finalized for feedback. This plan and the goal will be used to guide professional development and conversation throughout the year with staff.

SIP Monitoring

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

The School improvement plan will be monitored throughout the year as the leadership team meets and professional development is planned to ensure that what is happening ties back to the goals in the plan for the school .

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	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C

	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	16	24	21	25	18	23	0	0	0	127	
One or more suspensions	0	6	4	1	6	4	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	9	14	13	7	2	0	0	0	45	
Course failure in Math	0	4	6	8	7	8	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	9	4	6	7	0	0	0	34

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	6	39	17	27	11	32	0	0	0	132	
One or more suspensions	0	6	1	2	4	6	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	6	4	2	9	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	6	4	11	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	5	27	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	34	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	9	6	26	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	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	6	39	17	27	11	32	0	0	0	132	
One or more suspensions	0	6	1	2	4	6	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	6	4	2	9	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	6	4	11	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	5	27	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	34	0	0	0	49	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	9	6	26	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	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*	50	48	53	49	51	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				45			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			45		
Math Achievement*	49	50	59	47	46	50	44		
Math Learning Gains				48			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			45		
Science Achievement*	46	52	54	33	52	59	43		
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)	TSI
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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	301
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	26	Yes	4	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	72			
MUL	52			
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	59			
FRL	42			

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	29	Yes	3	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	23	Yes	1	1
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	50			49			46					
SWD	29			26			24				3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			36			37				4	
HSP	67			68							3	

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	61			43							2	
PAC												
WHT	58			58			61				4	
FRL	43			47			40				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	49	45	36	47	48	43	33					
SWD	20	37	37	31	41	29	7					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	49	55	38	46	50	26					
HSP	21	25		21	25							
MUL	45	29		48	40							
PAC												
WHT	61	48	33	57	55	50	44					
FRL	46	43	40	44	41	36	25					

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	44	39	45	44	47	45	43					
SWD	19	29		16	21		14					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	30	50	32	40	50	26					
HSP	38			38								
MUL	46	50		30	30							
PAC												
WHT	55	38		56	54		51					

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	40	39	55	39	45	50	36					

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	48%	49%	-1%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	44%	2%	50%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	55%	51%	4%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	61%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	51%	-6%

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.

Overall, math proficiency was the lowest, particularly in 5th grade. The 5th grade concerns centered around staffing and that problem has been remedied. Overall, math is a concern in all grade levels for McArthur. We struggle with some grade levels not moving onto the next skill because of a lack of mastery. This causes the class to fall behind on pacing and expected skills. The ELA lowest quartile and learning gains have trended low which also contribute to our low SWD subgroup scores. A contributing factor included an outdated model of inclusion support as well as a undefined intervention model.

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

Math showed the largest decrease from the previous year, particularly 5th grade. The lack of a defined math block that includes rigorous tier 1 instruction on the benchmarks as well as a defined remediation and intervention opportunity for those who need it contributed to this decrease.

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.

Math proficiency, 5th grade specifically had the largest gap. We have revamped the staff in the 5th grade to better serve our students. 5th grade math proficiency was 24% compared to the state at 55%. Overall, McArthur math is 52% with the state at 55%

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

Science improved by 9% overall. We did adjust our science plans to match the school transformation office plans that seem to serve our students better.

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

Attendance is a concern. It did have a slight improvement from the previous year but the number of students with 10 or more absences is still too high.

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

Increase proficiency and learning gains with the subgroup of students with disabilities

Increase proficiency in the area of mathematics school wide

Decrease the number of students that have 10 or more absences for the year

All classrooms will be trauma responsive with school wide processes and procedure outlined in each room which will decrease behavior concerns and increase emotional, mental and physical wellbeing of teachers and students

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Teacher retention is a crucial need. With the high level of teacher attrition and teachers leaving the field of education, McArthur must create an environment that is supportive to teachers and students emotional, social and mental well being. McArthur will retain 85% of the teachers on staff at the beginning of the school year 23-24. This will be accomplished through school wide support of trauma responsive practices for both teachers, staff, and students that is relationship based and provides support, awareness and focus on wellbeing of all members of the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the teacher retention goal will be through teacher and staff satisfaction surveys and the end of the year attrition and exit data of staff and teachers. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of school wide support of trauma responsive practices. The team will meet monthly with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future next steps for trauma responsive practices for both teachers and staff.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through teacher and staff satisfaction surveys and end of year attrition and exit data of staff and teachers.

Schools have a multitiered system in place that supports the behavioral practices—from the school wide to the individualized levels (10 Keys to Behavior- Tier 1)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Magee (himagee@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.)

Trauma responsive practices will be implemented schoolwide with not only students, but staff that focus on wellbeing of others and self. Strategies to identify compassion fatigue, secondary trauma for staff and of staff will be ongoing through the trauma leadership team and consulting with Serendipity trauma group. Staff will be trained in trauma responsive practices when handling student regulation issues and behavior concerns that will help solidify positive relationships while still holding student accountable for their actions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Trauma responsive practices are researched based practices dating back to the 1900's for people in fields where professionals cared for others. Even though research is somewhat limited specifically in school due to this being a new practice in schools, research shows that relationship based strategies such as trauma responsive practices helps lessen compassion fatigue and burnout in people whose primary job is to care for others. Compassion fatigue and burnout are two of the top causes of teacher attrition; connecting back to the secondary trauma and what is considered student behavior and discipline.

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.

Trauma leadership team will meet monthly to work both students and staff cases where more support is needed.

staff will participate in one pd a month focusing on trauma responsive practices

Daily, school wide mindfulness will be practiced school wide each day

Zones of regulation with both students and teachers will be school wide in all areas which allows for normalization of emotions and regulatory techniques to move from a level of dysregulation back to regulation.

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfi.us)

By When: End of year 23-24

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Achievement in Math has showed deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessment: Hispanic, Student with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups are below the 41 percent Federal Index. SWD's Federal Index is below 32 percent for the second consecutive year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math proficiency* will increase or maintain 51.2% (proficiency*), specifically 5th grade proficiency* will go from 35.6% to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment. ESSA subgroups include SWD (24.3%), African American/Black (40.6%), Economically Disadvantaged (50.5%), and Hispanic (66.7%) students. The ESSA subgroup for SWD will increase to 32% and African American/Black to 41% or higher.

* Proficiency levels indicated for 2023 are based on levels set as of July 2023

Monitoring:

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the ESSA subgroup Federal Index goal will be the district created assessments and progress monitoring assessments. Data spreadsheets will be utilized to track student assessment data, with a specific emphasis on the ESSA subgroups. These spreadsheets will be utilized to provide specific support and resources for both tier 1 instruction as well as specific interventions for students. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angie Harris (aharris@ecsdf.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) Strengthen differentiated Tier I instructional delivery through use of the Math Frameworks and B1G-M Instructional Guides. (Tier 1)
- 2) Increase teacher knowledge on use of assessment data to drive instruction. (Tier 1)
- 3) Instruction during the intervention should be explicit and systematic (Tier 3)
- 4) Strengthen the multi-tiered system of supports for all students (Tier 1)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In analyzing the 2023 FAST data and historical ESSA data, the below 32% Federal Index of the SWD and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups, indicates the need for the listed evidence-based interventions.

- 1) According to 10 Key Policies and Practices for All Schools, using differentiated instruction to support the delivery of Tier 1 instruction allows educators to quickly intervene with students who are struggling to be successful and has a positive result on student achievement.

2) According to 10 Key Mathematics Practices for All Elementary Schools, all elementary students can become proficient in mathematics if the school provides development to increase teacher knowledge on use of assessment data to drive instruction.

3) - 4) According to Practice Guide 12 and Practice Guide 26, from What Works Clearinghouse, providing explicit and systematic instruction and strengthening the multi-tiered support systems, indicates that taking early action may be key to helping students struggling with mathematics.

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.

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

Utilize the MTR's (Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning) to engage students in discussing mathematical thinking and reasoning, through the use of the instructional tasks.

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfi.us)

By When: B1G M and MTR's initial professional development: July 17, 2023 and July 24, 2023. The use of B1G M and MTR's will continue to occur weekly within grade level planning.

Create a master schedule that secures time for interventions (60 minutes for Elem.) and designated time for small groups during Tier 1 time.

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfi.us)

By When: The master schedule has already been completed and provided to teachers. (July 1, 2023)

Provide professional development on understanding STAR, FAST, iReady, Progress Learning) and determining next steps for instruction. T

Person Responsible: Carmen Higgins (chiggins@ecsdfi.us)

By When: This will be completed by August 1, 2023 for grades 1st through 5th. This will be completed for Kindergarten after the first PM and I-Ready diagnostic. are completed.

Review assessment data every two weeks and hold data meetings to identify students in need of intervention, and determine who will provide the intervention(s)

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Assessment data will be reviewed after module/unit assessments. Data will separately be reviewed weekly with SWD support educators. Data will be reviewed after each module/unit assessment with all educators.

Develop a system to provide and monitor data chats with students before the next assessment.

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfi.us)

By When: This will be completed before the first progress monitoring assessment.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Proficiency in assessed content areas has shown deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessments: Student with Disabilities (23.5%) and Black / African-American (38.9%) students subgroups are below the 41 percent Federal Index. SWD's Federal Index is below 32 percent for the second consecutive year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math proficiency* will increase or maintain 51.2% (proficiency*), specifically 5th grade proficiency* will go from 35.6% to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment.

ESSA subgroups include SWD (24.3%), African American/Black (40.6%), Economically Disadvantaged (50.5%), and Hispanic (66.7%) students. The ESSA subgroup for SWD will increase to 32% and African American/Black to 41% or higher.

ELA proficiency will increase or maintain at 54.4% (proficiency*) on the 2024 FAST PM3, specifically 3rd and 5th grade proficiency* will go from 46% to 50% and 49% to 50% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment.

ESSA subgroups include SWD (25%), African American/Black (39.6%), Economically Disadvantaged (48.6%), and Hispanic students (60%). The ESSA subgroup for SWD will increase to 32% and African American/Black will increase to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment.

* Proficiency levels indicated for 2023 are based on levels set as of July 2023

Monitoring:

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the math goal will be district created topic tests, and quarterly progress monitoring. The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the ELA goal will be district module tests, and quarterly progress monitoring.

The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Magee (himagee@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. Multitiered systems are in place to support the academic and behavioral progress of all students and to allow educators to quickly intervene with students who are struggling to be successful. (Tier 1)
2. Instruction during the intervention should be explicit and systematic. (Tier 3)
3. Intensify interventions for students by maximizing human resources through scheduling and training (Tier 3)
4. Increase teacher knowledge on use of assessment data to drive instruction (Tier 1)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. According to Practice Guide 12 and Practice Guide 26, from What Works Clearinghouse, providing explicit and systematic instruction and strengthening the multi-tiered support systems, indicates that taking early action may be key to helping students struggling with mathematics.
2. - 3. According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works Clearing House, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies, and opportunities for extended discussion shows positive impact on student achievement.
4. According to Supporting a Culture of Data Literacy and Use to Improve Instructional Quality, to increase stakeholders' understanding that the data are reliable, useful, and being used to make meaningful decisions will result in a positive impact on 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 a master schedule that secures time for interventions (60 minutes for Elem.)

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdf.us)

By When: The schedule will be created and implemented prior to August 10, 2023.

1. The leadership team will analyze data from screening and progress monitoring assessments and identify trends.
2. Use the ELA Decision tree to determine targeted evidence based interventions for identified students.
3. Provide professional development on use of data with the ELA Intervention Decision Tree.

Person Responsible: Carmen Higgins (chiggins@ecsdf.us)

By When: The Eagle Hour schedule and small groups will be implemented by September 4, 2023. The training for the ELA Decision Tree will occur 8/21/23.

Monitor implementation of interventions through RtI meetings and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Tiffanie Matrone (tmatrone@ecsdf.us)

By When: Walkthroughs are completed weekly RTI meetings are continuously scheduled for the entire year and documented in google calendar

Administration team will use a common planning protocol school-wide, in addition to a separate time to plan with ESE/Inclusion support. Planning will include a focus on differentiated tier 1 instruction, data review, and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdf.us)

By When: To begin August 10, 2023 and continue weekly, each Monday

Review assessment data every two weeks and hold data meetings to identify students in need of intervention, and determine who will provide the intervention(s).

Person Responsible: Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdf.us)

By When: To begin August 10, 2023 and continue throughout the 23-24 school year

1. The leadership team will meet with teachers to share school-wide data.
2. Provide professional development on understanding of the STAR & FAST assessment, as well as the

iReady program, and determining next steps for instruction

A Develop a system to provide and monitor data chats with students before the next assessment.

Person Responsible: Carmen Higgins (chiggins@ecsdfi.us)

By When: School-wide data to be shared by Magee during pre-planning week Professional development on I-Ready 8/28/23 Training on STAR (8/30/23) and FAST (8/23/23) to be provided by Higgins

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Funding allocations for Title I funds are based on survey 3 poverty data. Schools receive these allocations in the spring and work with Title I and the level directors to determine how those funds are utilized. Title I schools also receive additional funding for low income students to support parent involvement. UniSIG allocations are based on school grade and overall Federal Index rates and are received in late summer. The schools work with the School Transformation Office (STO) and level directors to determine the usage of these funds to maximize impact on student achievement. Both Title I and UniSIG are aligned so there are no resource duplications between these two main school improvement funding sources. The Human Resource Department works with Budgeting, Finance, Title I, STO, and Executive staff to review staffing to ensure schools in need have staffing that reflects the need of the school. Title I, UniSIG, Reading Allocation, ESSER, and SAI funding sources are utilized to add supplemental positions to meet the needs of schools and align to state and district goals. School Improvement funding allocations are also utilized to pay staff to attend planning sessions and professional development sessions with the Professional Development Department and STO based on input from BSI and the district. The district identifies resources for coaching and planning support through the level directors, School Transformation Office, Title I, and Professional Development Department. Schools are tiered based on need including school grade, overall federal index, graduation rates, and ESSA subgroup data. Supplemental resources in addition to the district purchased core resources are reviewed based on the school need and approved for purchase utilizing school improvement funding and SAI funding. The district has also begun to utilize Canvas as the LMS to help support resource allocation to include benchmark aligned lessons, professional development, and content training for schools. Additional support that is identified by quarterly meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

26% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

41% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

23% 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 53% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 28% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 52% on the 2023 FAST.

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2023 will increase for grades kindergarten through 2nd grade to 50% or higher on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

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.

Magee, Holly, hmagee@escambia.k12.fl.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?

McArthur Elementary 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 Rtl teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-

Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.

Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.

Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.

Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-

District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate use of the literacy practice profiles in the delivery of instruction with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.

Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.

Action Step 3: Assessment

Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.

Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.

Action Step 4: Professional Learning -

We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:

Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees

Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.

Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan

The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading.

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 sip will be shared with the leadership team before being finalized and all changes will be made at that time. Once finalized the plan will be shared with all staff during a faculty meeting on how this applies to planning and administration of content in classrooms. The SIP will shared with families on Title one family night and communicated in friendly language for families and stakeholders.

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))

Trauma responsive practices will be implemented school-wide with not only students, but staff that focus on wellbeing of others and self. Strategies to identify compassion fatigue, secondary trauma for staff and of staff will be ongoing through the trauma leadership team and consulting with Serendipity trauma group. Staff will be trained in trauma responsive practices when handling student regulation issues and behavior concerns that will help solidify positive relationships while still holding student accountable for their actions.

We will have family nights that center around awareness of Trauma practices utilized in the school that families can use at home. We will have parent teacher conferences with every parent. We will encourage volunteer opportunities throughout the school year to engage parents in their child's education. We will also help families understand the Focus Parent portal to help families keep up with their child's educational progress.

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))

We will continue with dedicated intervention hour for ELA with research based interventions. This will allow for accelerated curriculum for student that are not in need of intervention, but rather enrichment. The focus on Tier one on grade level instruction will continue to be a Focus for Classroom walk-throughs. In the area of Math, a dedicated time for intervention will begin in all classrooms that allow for intervention or enrichment based on student needs.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

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))

Through creation of a Trauma Responsive school with focuses on relational practices between student staff and families, along with regulating and self regulating skills improving student skills outside the academic area will be a focus. Teachers and staff will utilize school counselor, school based mental health, and Navigator when student and or families have needs that require additional support.

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).

Through implementation of Trauma Responsive practices and PBIS, students will begin in Kindergarten working on self-regulation strategies, identification of emotions and tools to help them regulate. The trauma leadership team led by the school behavior coach will meet monthly to discuss student concerns, Tier 1 behavior concerns as well as teacher support needed throughout the school and create plans of support in these areas.

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))

NAA

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))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No