

Escambia County School District

N. B. Cook 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

N. B. Cook Elementary School

1310 N 12TH AVE, Pensacola, FL 32503

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.

N.B. Cook Elementary School of the Arts is committed to providing a positive learning environment which integrates the creative and technological abilities of children into the academic curriculum. Our mission is to provide children with learning experiences that will enable them to become productive members of society, of worth to themselves and others, by encouraging academic, technological, and social growth while developing aesthetic values in the creative and performing arts.

Our personnel believe a creative and performing arts program offers the emotional, social, and academic enhancements that will provide for the development of well-rounded, self-confident, motivated, and socially conscious individuals. We also feel that the arts are a natural way for children to experience success while learning. We know that children love singing, moving, drawing, and pretending. We want to capitalize on these avenues as a way of enhancing the academics.

Provide the school's vision statement.

N.B. Cook Elementary School of the Arts is committed to providing a positive learning environment which integrates the creative and technological abilities of children into the academic curriculum. Our mission is to provide children with learning experiences that will enable them to become productive members of society, of worth to themselves and others, by encouraging academic, technological, and social growth while developing aesthetic values in the creative and performing arts.

Our personnel believe a creative and performing arts program offers the emotional, social, and academic enhancements that will provide for the development of well-rounded, self-confident, motivated, and socially conscious individuals. We also feel that the arts are a natural way for children to experience success while learning. We know that children love singing, moving, drawing, and pretending. We want to capitalize on these avenues as a way of enhancing the academics.

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
Knight, Larry	Principal	
Cothran, Laurie	Assistant Principal	
Kilpatrick, Betsy	Teacher, K-12	
Ueberroth, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Hayes, Michael	Teacher, K-12	
Collins, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Dubuc, Katie	Teacher, K-12	
Pierce, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Eligio, Mark	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.

Our school has monthly leadership team meetings in addition to monthly school advisory council meetings. Data is shared and reviewed with both teams, strategies are discussed, and input is tracked. We also hold monthly town hall meetings where members of our community are able to visit our school for informal conversations with the administrative team. Their questions and concerns are reviewed and, when possible, changes are implemented.

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))

Our SIP is a fluid document with the intended purpose to actively monitor student and faculty/staff growth while allowing all stakeholders an ability to view a snapshot of our school and its progress. Each quarter, our school's leadership team will review data to determine growth towards objectives and goals and revise as needed. Progress towards our goals is also shared and discussed with our School Advisory Council.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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	2021-22: A

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	11	7	7	3	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	3	6	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	10	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	9	2	1	2	0	0	0	19	

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

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

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	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	1	11	7	7	3	9	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8	
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		

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	11	7	7	3	9	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8	
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		

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	71	48	53	76	51	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				61			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			17		
Math Achievement*	74	50	59	84	46	50	80		
Math Learning Gains				68			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			32		
Science Achievement*	75	52	54	77	52	59	73		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
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	75			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	83			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	87			

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	66			

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	65			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	76			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	56			

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	71			74			75					
SWD	59			73							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			40			41				4	
HSP	71			88							3	
MUL	85			69							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
PAC												
WHT	81			86			90				4	
FRL	57			64			69				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	76	61	50	84	68	48	77					
SWD	61	73		72	55							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	46	45	56	49	38	61					
HSP	86	50		86	80							
MUL	90	64		95	82							
PAC												
WHT	85	67	54	93	73	60	82					
FRL	66	49	40	74	60	29	74					

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	75	45	17	80	44	32	73					
SWD	59			59								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	25	8	59	18	18	29					
HSP	85			75								
MUL	89			95								
PAC												
WHT	83	49		88	53		86					
FRL	68	43	12	75	34	29	65					

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	71%	49%	22%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	44%	36%	50%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	51%	33%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	47%	20%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	51%	24%	51%	24%

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.

When comparing our subgroup data, our Lowest Quartile students performed significantly lower in both English Language Arts and Math (37.2% and 29.73%, respectively). This has been a trend within our school's population.

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

The greatest decline of achievement is found again in our Lowest Quartile students. Their decline can be attributed to adjustment to a new state test (FSA to FAST) and adoption of new standards (LAFS to

BEST). Although these are outside barriers, we understand the gravity of this steep decline of our lowest quartile students. We have started our data meetings with teachers earlier this year and are already targeting instruction for these students.

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 greatest gap in achievement can be found when comparing our African American students (42.4%) to our White students (82.4%). This 20 point gap has decreased over the past seven years from at least a 30 point gap. So, we are trending in the right direction.

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

The component showing the most improvement was SWD. There were no new actions taken, however, we focused on improving small group instruction for this group of students, particularly in the area of math.

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

There are no great areas of concern when viewing our EWS data. However, because we desire that all students are meeting grade level expectations, the students with severe reading deficiencies will be receive the appropriate intervention through RTI and/or ESE services.

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

1. Improving learning gains for our students in the lowest quartile.
2. Maintaining proficiency and demonstrating learning gains for students scoring at levels 4 and 5

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our school was able to retain 79% of our faculty and staff coming into the 2023 - 2024 school year. A variety of reasons attributed to those that are no longer employed on our campus including, resignation, retirement, non-renewal, and career change. Factors that attributed to personnel retention include creating a positive culture, providing fellowship opportunities for our faculty/staff members, and providing instructional support as needed. This year, our plans to increase faculty/staff morale will attribute to faculty and staff retention. We will retain 85% or more of our faculty and staff.

Monitoring:

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

Faculty and staff check ins will be monitored. The 'pulse' of our campus will be determined through monthly faculty/staff treats, drawings/prizes, opportunities for praise from the administrative team and peers, and more.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Larry Knight (lknight2@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Retention of faculty/staff enables our school to build a family-like culture. The relationships are constantly built upon and developed. Peers support each other and empower each other to be successful. When teacher retention is high, the consistency for our student increases.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

An area of focus for our school is the achievement gap between our White students and African American students. Historically, our White students score significantly higher on both Reading and Math proficiency when compared to our other subgroups. However, the greatest gap is found within our African American students. We are working to increase the proficiency of our African American students to at least 50% or higher, up from 42.4%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We are working to increase the proficiency of our African American students to at least 50% or higher, up from 42.4%.

Monitoring:

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

Our administrative team will hold monthly data meetings with all classroom and inclusion teachers to identify students in need of interventions. During the discussions, we will also track our students progress based on targeted groups to include our African American students and Lowest Quartile students. Progress monitoring, in addition to our FAST testing, will also contribute to the ability of tracking our students' progress and enable us to implement interventions where needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Larry Knight (lknight2@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.)

Targeted instruction using our district's adopted curriculum to support students identified as struggling. We will also use the Response to Intervention (RtI) process to track our students' growth and response to interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By specifically using the research-based district adopted curriculum and interventions, we can assure small group instruction will help our faculty and staff target students and deliver more effective, individualized instruction for all students.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus