
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Navy Point Elementary School

1321 PATTON DR, Pensacola, FL 32507

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.

Navy Point Elementary's mission is to cultivate a school community where all members of the community will work together to motivate students to develop into successful learners, good citizens, and future leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Navy Point Elementary's vision is to create a school where all stakeholders work as a united front for the academic success of all students. Navy Point will be the school where excellence for all students take flight.

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
Ford-Harris, Monica	Principal	As principal, its my responsibility to ensure all team members have the resources and supports needed to complete their daily tasks. I am responsible for reviewing data and guiding all stakeholders in the disaggregation of the data for improving student achievement. I am responsible for meeting and planning with Science teachers. I am also responsible for providing regular constructive feedback for professional growth through classroom walkthroughs.
Freeman, Jacob	Assistant Principal	Mr. Freeman's responsibility is to support improving student achievement by meeting and planning with Math teachers. He will provide the Math teachers regularly and timely feedback regarding their data. As a member of the leadership team, he is also responsible for providing constructive feedback for professional growth through weekly classroom walks.
Garner, Latris	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. Garner's responsibility is to support improving student achievement by meeting and planning with ELA teachers. She will provide the ELA teachers regularly and timely feedback regarding their data. As a member of the leadership team, she is also responsible for providing constructive feedback for professional growth through weekly classroom walks. She is also leading a book study, "Joy in Teaching".
Rose, Tiffany	Instructional Media	Mrs. Rose's responsibility will be to assist teachers and students with AR needs. She will be responsible for helping to monitor our school's progress towards meeting the monthly and quarterly reading goals. She will help with the monthly student recognition incentives. She will also help to ensure students are selecting books of choice within their appropriate reading level.

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.

Navy Point held a School Advisory Council meeting in March 2023, to solicit input from stakeholders. At that time, the attendees felt that our plans were working well based on the data and encouraged the school to continue implementing the strategies that were effective. We plan to continue soliciting input and sharing out our progress through the Title I Annual Meeting in September 2023, as well as the quarterly School Advisory Council meetings throughout the school year.

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))

Navy Point will use monthly data meetings to help monitor our implementation of the school improvement goals, as well as to progress monitor the effectiveness of our plan. The leadership team will meet weekly to analyze the walkthrough data to determine the need for teacher supports, instructional adjustments needed, as well as any additional interventions to ensure the academic goals are reached for all students.

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	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	33	24	24	18	19	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	7	4	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	2	12	4	3	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	6	4	7	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	11	19	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	14	17	0	0	0	36
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	2	4	13	14	15	0	0	0	48

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	9	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	15	39	32	25	24	20	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	5	4	4	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	13	6	2	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	6	5	6	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	18	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	15	0	0	0	35
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	8	14	16	13	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	15	39	32	25	24	20	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	5	4	4	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	13	6	2	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	6	5	6	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	18	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	15	0	0	0	35
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

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	8	14	16	13	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	26
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*	50	48	53	44	51	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				61			21		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			38		
Math Achievement*	51	50	59	41	46	50	27		
Math Learning Gains				73			16		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			18		
Science Achievement*	40	52	54	42	52	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	47	62	59	68			52		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	45			
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	46			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	46			

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	57			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	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%
MUL	34	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	57			

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			51			40					47
SWD	41			41			42				4	
ELL	25			55			20				4	47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			48			29				4	
HSP	36			58			40				4	48
MUL	62			48							3	
PAC												
WHT	59			44			55				4	
FRL	47			41			39				5	50

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	44	61	61	41	73	70	42					68
SWD	48	59		44	85		47					
ELL	35	73		40	73							68
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	39	56	55	34	69	73	35					
HSP	47	70		44	74		30					67
MUL	39			28								
PAC												
WHT	50	71		50	78		53					
FRL	41	62	65	41	73	65	35					73

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	35	21	38	27	16	18	37					52
SWD	42	10		36	15		33					
ELL	24			35								52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	10		18	3	0	20					
HSP	38	27		26	18		27					50
MUL	36			21								
PAC												
WHT	51	38		42	38		65					
FRL	31	22	42	24	10	15	30					

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	44%	49%	-5%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	51%	-2%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	58%	-27%	61%	-30%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	51%	-19%	51%	-19%

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.

Navy Point's lowest performing area was science based on the 2022-2023 F.C.A.T. 2.0 assessment. Based on our 2021-2022 data we had 42% proficiency in science and this dropped to 37% for 2022-2023. This was a 5 percentage point decrease for our school overall.

Our ELL population increased this past school year and many were non-English speakers. Their lack of English proficiency directly impacted their understanding of subject-specific vocabulary and other pertinent science content.

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

Navy Point's lowest performing area was science based on the 2022-2023 F.C.A.T. 2.0 assessment. Based on our 2021-2022 data we had 42% proficiency in science and this dropped to 37% for 2022-2023. This was a 5 percentage point decrease for our school overall.

Our ELL population increased this past school year and many were non-English speakers. Their lack of English proficiency directly impacted their understanding of subject-specific vocabulary and other pertinent science content.

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.

Navy Point's data component with the greatest achievement gap compared to the state average is science. 37% of our students were proficient, compared to the state average of 51%, indicating a 14% proficiency gap. Again, the main factor that contributed to this gap was our increased ELL population this past school year. Many were non-English speakers, and their lack of English proficiency directly impacted their understanding of subject-specific vocabulary and other science content.

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

Navy Point's ELA data demonstrated the greatest improvement based on the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. reading assessment. According to the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment, 44% of our students were proficient. Based on the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. assessment data, our ELA proficiency increased to 53%, which was an overall increase of 9 percentage points.

We held data meetings following each module assessment to discuss interventions/remediation plans. iReady data was monitored weekly, with specific student feedback provided. Student lesson pathways were regularly reviewed and adjusted based on needs. Daily small groups targeting specific standards were held.

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

We have two potential areas of concern based on our Early Warning System data; the number of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade with 10% or more absences and the number of students in 3rd through 5th grade with two or more early warning indicators.

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

Navy Point will continue to make improving student attendance and tardies a top priority. We will continue to track the progress monitoring data of our SWD, ELL, and multi-racial subgroups to ensure we are on track to meet our end of year federal index goals.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Navy Point's math proficiency has demonstrated an increase from 41% on the Florida Standards Assessment in 2022 to 51% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) test in 2023, an increase of 10%.

The proficiency percentages for the subgroups are as follows: SWD decreased from 44% in 2022 to 40% in 2023, African-Americans increased from 34% to 47%, Hispanics increased from 44% to 56%, Whites decreased from 50% to 46%, ELL increased from 40% to 55%, and free and reduced lunch students decreased from 41% to 40%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Navy Point's measurable math goal will continue to be 45% proficiency or higher as measured by the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking data. This is based on the anticipated scale score changes to be released in the Fall of 2023.

Monitoring:

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

1. Navy Point's administrative team will pull weekly i-Ready math reports to review and provide teachers feedback.
2. Teachers will administer quarterly assessments that are developed by the district Math Department for progress monitoring of students on the standards to have been taught during the nine week period. We will also use the topic assessment data to monitor students' need for reteaching of standards not mastered. In addition, we will use Measuring Up and Everglades lessons to reteach and remediate standards as needed.
3. F.A.S.T will be used as the school's benchmark assessment to measure students' progress throughout the year.
4. The administrative team will complete weekly walkthroughs focused on specific look fors to include standards alignment, student engagement, and informal assessment strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacob Freeman (jfreeman@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. Navy Point will be using i-Ready daily lessons for regular monitoring of progress. i-Ready reteach lessons will be used to remediate standards not yet mastered.
2. Navy Point will use Reflex/Frax to help with fluency and fraction instruction.
2. The Savvas series provides a reteach component that will also be used for remediation.
3. Everglades B.E.S.T. Mathematics, as well as Measuring Up workbooks and assessments will be used for small group, remediation, and spiral review.
4. Those students who are in need of enrichment activities will use the study buddy component for independent work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The i-Ready tools, Everglades workbooks, Measuring Up Math, Reflex/Frax, and Savvas are all aligned to the current standards that will be assessed on F.A.S.T. They offer research-based resources that are proven effective for remediation and enrichment needs. Teachers are able to adjust the lessons based on the targeted standards for remediation or reteaching as needed.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Navy Point implements the departmentalization model at grades 2-5. This allows for targeted instructional support by content area. The math teachers will meet weekly to bi-weekly with the Assistant Principal depending on the need of the team. During this time, teachers will focus on student data and planning for instruction.

Person Responsible: Jacob Freeman (jfreeman@ecsdf.us)

By When: On-going throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Navy Point demonstrated an upward move based on the 2023 F.A.S.T. Reading Assessment data. We were at 44% proficiency in 2022 and up 9 percentage points to 53% proficiency in 2023.

Due to the testing transition year, our subgroup data reflects the same as 2021-2022. However, after analyzing our school specific data for the 2022-2023 school year, we identified that our ELL (25%) and SWD (35%) each demonstrated a decrease from the previous year. Our multi-racial subgroup actually demonstrated an increase from 34% in 2022 to 67% in 2023. Navy Point will continue to monitor all three subgroups closely during progress monitoring windows to ensure that the 41% needed is met.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Navy Point's measureable ELA goal will continue to be 50% proficiency or higher as measured by the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking data. This is based on the anticipated scale score changes to be released in the Fall of 2023.

Monitoring:

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

1. Navy Point will be using i-Ready daily lessons for regular monitoring of progress. i-Ready reteach lessons will be used to remediate standards not yet mastered. In addition, we will use Measuring Up ELA lessons to reteach and remediate standards as needed.
2. The administrative team will conduct weekly classroom walks to observe for standards alignment, student engagement, and other specific look fors.
3. Teachers and administration will analyze the results from the module assessments. Immediate remediation/intervention plans will be developed and implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Latris Garner (lgarner@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Navy Point uses HMH Into Reading for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program.

The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components 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 for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 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.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership

- Develop a school-wide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.
- Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.
- Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.

Person Responsible: Latris Garner (lgarner@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The school-wide reading plan and professional develop on B.E.S.T. ELA standards will be completed by August 2023. The grade-level data and classroom walkthrough data reviews will be on-going.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Navy Point's science proficiency demonstrated a decrease based on the F.C.A.T. 2.0 Assessment. Proficiency was 42% in 2022 and decreased to 37% in 2023.

The proficiency percentages for the subgroups are as follow: SWD decreased from 47% in 2022 to 25% in 2023, African-Americans decreased from 35% to 25%, Hispanics increased from 30% to 31%, and Whites increased from 53% to 55%. Although our multi-racial subgroup demonstrated 60% proficiency, we will continue to monitor the group to ensure the meet or exceed the 41% required for the federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Navy Point's measureable science goal will continue to be 45% proficiency or higher as measured by the 2024 F.C.A.T. 2.0 Assessment data. This is due to our decrease in proficiency numbers from 42% to 37% in 2022.

Monitoring:

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

1. Navy Point will administer quarterly assessments for progress monitoring. The data will be used to remediate standards not yet mastered.
2. The HMH curriculum, as well as the district science developed resources will be used. These are all aligned to the standards.
3. The review labs will be used throughout the year and revisited just before testing.
4. Study Island will be used as an additional reteach/remediation tool.
5. The administrative team will complete weekly walkthroughs focused on specific look fors to include standards alignment, student engagement, and informal assessment strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. The HMH series provides a reteach component that will also be used for remediation.
2. Teachers will use Study Island lessons for remediation purposes as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

HMH offers research-based resources that are proven effective for remediation and enrichment needs. Study Island lessons are aligned with the standards and students complete a quick assessment at the end of lesson for progress monitoring towards standard mastery purposes.

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 3 - Promising 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.

1. Navy Point implements the departmentalization model at grades 2-5. This allows for targeted instructional support by content area. The science teachers will meet weekly to bi-weekly with the Principal depending on the need of the team. During this time teachers will focus on student data and planning for instruction.

Person Responsible: Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfi.us)

By When: On-going throughout the year.

2. The ESOL teacher or teacher assistant will spend 20-30 minutes, at least 3 days per week providing explicit lessons on science vocabulary terms.

Person Responsible: Monica Ford-Harris (mford-harris@ecsdfi.us)

By When: On-going throughout the year.

#4. 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.

Navy Point Elementary had a large number of students absent 10% or more days (132 students) in the 2022-2023 school year, which greatly increases the risk of those students falling behind and scoring lower on standardized tests. We would like to increase our average daily attendance to 91% or better for the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Navy Point Elementary's average daily attendance will increase to 91% or above and the number of students with 10% or more days absent will decrease for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

1. Average daily attendance and the number of students with 10% or more absences for the year will be measured and monitored each week using district FOCUS reports.
2. Notification of needed attendance meetings in FOCUS.
3. Review of late check-in and out report in FOCUS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bernita Gooden (bgooden@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.)

We will use several strategies from "Increasing School Attendance for K-8 Students" found on AttendanceWorks, including family involvement, individualized treatments, and attendance groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All three strategies have been shown to improve attendance rates with suggestive evidence.

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.

1. After 3 consecutive absences, the teacher or Guidance Counselor/Navigator will reach out to the family via telephone to determine the reason for the absences and work to set a meeting. During the meeting the counselor/navigator will work to determine an individualized plan with the student and parent to improve attendance. If contact is unsuccessful or absences continue, the Navigator will do a home visit.
2. The counselor/navigator will work with teachers to form attendance groups for students who are habitually absent, and oversee the groups on a bi-weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Bernita Gooden (bgooden@ecsdfl.us)

By When: On-going throughout the year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

67% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

74% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

67% 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 51% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 50% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 49% 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.

1. 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.

Ford-Harris, Monica, mford-harris@ecsdf.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Navy Point 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
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Ford-Harris, Monica, mford-harris@ecsdf.us</p>
<p>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</p>	

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

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

Throughout the school year, SIP progress is regularly shared and discussed through the School

Advisory Council. Regardless of membership status, all stakeholders are invited to attend School Advisory Council meetings. Progress is also discussed and shared during monthly data meetings, as well as faculty meetings following each progress monitoring period.

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

Navy Point Elementary website: <https://www.escambiaschools.org/npes>

Title I website: <https://www.escambiaschools.org/title1>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

During the 23-24 school year, parent conferences will be held by all teachers to share the progress of each student. FAST data will be reviewed with families. Two academic Family Nights are scheduled to build the capacity of families in Language Arts and Math. Teachers will share strategies which can be used at home. Teachers send daily and/or weekly information home to parents regarding their child's academic and social progress.

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

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

Navy Point Elementary's Our Title I Page: <https://www.escambiaschools.org/Page/5105>

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)

Navy Point will provide an after-school tutoring opportunity for all students. However, special attention will be provided to students included in our ELL, SWD, and Multi-racial subgroups. These three groups are focus groups that we will target to ensure that we meet or exceed the 41% on the Federal Index.

During the school day, the same group of students will also receive intensive remediation through the use of targeted small groups. Our team will use the progress monitoring assessments, as well as the unit assessments to guide the standards of focus.

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))

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

Title I, Part C: Migrant families participate in a LEA Advisory Council for English Language Learners. Translators are available for teacher conferences as well as to assist with translation of documents to be

provided for families. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy development activities.

ESOL-Title III: Provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) such as services and paraprofessionals.

Title IX, Part A: Provides hygiene items, school supplies, enrollment assistance, social work, and advocacy. Assistance for housing, food, clothing, and other emergency support are available for families referred under Title IX.

IDEA: Provides students with disabilities a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) that is tailored to their individual needs including an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), appropriate evaluation, parent and teacher participation, and procedural safeguards.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school utilizes services from Lakeview Counseling based on referrals from our guidance counselor and teachers. The counselor meets with children weekly. We use resources from the Gulf Coast Kids House which educate and empower children about the dangers present in society today and how to help adults keep them safe. We use interventions from Suite360 for mental health and behavior as well.

The assistant principal will coordinate volunteers and mentors for students most in need.

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).

Our school uses PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) as our schoolwide tiered behavior system. There are many tier I supports and rewards including coaching and modeling expectations from the PBIS coach, positive rewards system in Focus and a school store, and quarterly PBIS celebrations for all students.

For tier II, our RTI Coordinator and Guidance Counselor work with classroom teachers to write individualized behavior plans, as well as check in/check out programs and self-regulation groups. Suite360 interventions are also used for Tier II students as needed.

For Tier III, there are teachers on campus trained in the FBA/PBIP intervention process.

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))

Our school is departmentalized from 2nd to 5th grade, and our principal, assistant principal, and curriculum coordinator all specialize and coach in a core subject area. Each coach meets with their respective subject area teachers weekly to discuss upcoming standards to be taught and assessment results in depth. These data and planning meetings are used to backwards plan based on assessments, as well as determine enrichment activities and interventions. We also engage in district wide professional learning and school based professional learning, including trainings on STAR360/Accelerated Reader, iReady, and ExploreLearning.

Our school's Curriculum Coordinator will also lead a book study on "Joy in Teaching", with opportunities for other self-paced book studies throughout the year.

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))

Parents are given information including strategies to make transitions smoother and help them work with their children at parent/teacher conferences, in newsletters, and at school events. Teachers also share VPK assessment results with parents after each administration so that parents know their students' progress and where they fall in the expectation of being Kindergarten Ready.

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