

Escambia County School District

Pleasant Grove 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, 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.

The mission at Pleasant Grove Elementary is to encourage learning and creativity that will prepare students for success and lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Pleasant Grove is to promote the recognition of positive behaviors and academic success that aligns with school-wide expectations to create a positive learning environment encouraging students, teachers, staff, and parents to exhibit school and community pride.

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
Corrigan, Anne	Teacher, ESE	Provide insight on students with disabilities: how to increase proficiency and growth.
Owens-Braggs, Nicole	Principal	Maintains school-wide data; analyze effectiveness of implementations; Confer with stakeholders to maximize growth opportunities
Tapparo, Susan	Assistant Principal	
Blackmon, Dyana	Teacher, K-12	Monitor and analyze 3rd grade data for celebrations and recommendations to reach grade level goals.
Downs, Alice		Monitor and analyze 5th grade data for celebrations and recommendations to reach grade level goals.
Town, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Monitor and analyze first grade data to offer celebrations and recommendations to reach grade level goals.
Restifo, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Monitor and analyze 2nd grade data for celebrations and recommendations to reach grade level goals.
Hunt, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Monitor and analyze kindergarten data to celebrate and offer recommendations to meet grade level expectations.

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.

During the yearly Title 1 meeting, the school-wide data and goals will be provided to stakeholders. Stakeholders will be asked for input on school improvement. The leadership team will meet monthly to discuss progress towards goals and will disseminate information to the grade levels during weekly PLCs. Stakeholders (school and community) will receive information concerning student data on a regular basis.

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))

Student assessments (state progress monitoring and classroom assessments) are monitored for movement toward individual student goals. During our weekly PLCs, the students with the greatest academic gaps will be monitored for one year of academic growth. If it is determined that revisions are needed, the leadership team will determine the next steps during the monthly meetings.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B

	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	7	26	29	27	16	17	0	0	0	122	
One or more suspensions	7	4	1	8	4	5	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	2	4	3	0	0	0	13	
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	1	4	3	6	3	2	0	0	0	19

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	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	8
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	9	28	23	19	18	29	0	0	0	126	
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	3	3	10	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	16	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	15	0	0	0	28	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	3	7	16	0	0	0	34	

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	4	4	3	2	10	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	9	28	23	19	18	29	0	0	0	126	
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	3	3	10	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	16	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	15	0	0	0	28	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	3	7	16	0	0	0	34	

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	4	4	3	2	10	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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*	61	48	53	66	51	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				68			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			36		
Math Achievement*	67	50	59	71	46	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				59			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			48		
Science Achievement*	66	52	54	62	52	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		62	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	251
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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
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	27	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	64			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	73			

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	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	83			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	51			

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	61			67			66					
SWD	29			34			38				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			48			46				4	
HSP	61			70			60				3	
MUL	68			75							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	70			76			80				4	
FRL	55			61			56				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	66	68	42	71	59	38	62					
SWD	28	48	43	39	24	13	27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	55	23	53	43	40	53					
HSP	74	83		84	92							
MUL	67	63		70	50		70					
PAC												
WHT	72	75	56	75	62	35	59					
FRL	57	61	41	63	56	32	46					

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	52	40	36	60	53	48	48					
SWD	32	45	50	23	36	31	22					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	42		47	50		41					
HSP	58			58			70					
MUL	66			76								
PAC												
WHT	56	38		62	54		46					
FRL	46	39	31	52	52	44	42					

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	67%	49%	18%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	51%	19%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	47%	15%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	51%	12%

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.

Students in the math lower quartile group did not make the expected gains for one year. In math lower quartile gains was 38 percent. SWDs was 13 percent.

The general trend in this area has been downward. In 2018-2019, the math learning gains was 57 percent. SWDs was 55%.

Students are lacking mathematical fact fluency, time for mastery, practice, and movement from conceptual to abstract thinking processes.

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

The greatest decline is math. Proficiency dropped from 71% in 2022 to 67% in 2023.

SWDs scored 39% in proficiency in 2022 to 27% in 2023. The drop is a negative 12 percent

As students become identified as SWDs the denominator changes and the goals or growth becomes harder to reach.

A contributing factor was that the number of students entering the accountable grade levels (grades 3-5) was lower in proficiency (or one year's growth of gain towards proficiency) than in previous school years.

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.

According to the data, PGE scored greater in proficiency than the state and district. In ELA PGE scored 10.3% higher than the state.

In math PGE also scored higher than the state in proficiency. PGE scored 67.4%. The state scored 58%. In science PGE scored 67%. The state's proficiency was 51%.

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

The component showing the most improvement was mathematics proficiency. After students were identified through data meetings at each grade level, teachers met with students in small group settings. Each small group meeting focused on specific targeted instructional needs.

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

The areas of concern based on our EWS are SWDs absences and suspensions.

At the beginning of the year SWDs absences was 37.66%. Quarter four the absences dropped to 35%. The overall absences at the beginning of the year was 21%. At the end of the year it was 25%.

SWDs suspensions at the beginning of the year was 6%. During the 4th quarter it was 8%.

The overall suspensions was 3% at the beginning of the year. At the end of the year it was 6%.

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

Our highest priorities are:

1. SWDs Absences/tardies
2. SWDs Math growth
3. SWDs Proficiency in Science
4. SWDs Math proficiency
5. ELA Learning Gains

Area of Focus

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

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

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

According to the overall federal index, SWDs continue to be an area that Pleasant Grove Elementary needs to improve. In 2022 the federal index was 32%. This area should be more than 41% on 2024 FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The SWD Federal index score will improve from 32% to 41% or above on the 2024 FAST. The increase should be a minimal of 9% or above.

We currently have 40 SWDs with disabilities in grade 3rd through fifth. It would take 20 of these students to score 50% of growth. Or it will take 17 students to have 42.5% growth.

Monitoring:

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

The admin team, ESE teacher leader and the 5th grade leader will monitor and maintain proficiency and students targeted proficiency in reading, math, and science during the monthly data meetings and leadership meetings.

SWDs yearly growth, once defined, will be monitored in math and reading during the 2024 FAST assessment monthly.

SWDs Math, reading, and science district assessments will be monitored by admin and classroom teachers to determine if students are meeting individualized targets. The data will be shared and discussed at the weekly PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anne Corrigan (acorrigan@escmabia.k12.fl.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.)

It will be evident during walk-throughs that teachers are scaffolding learning expectations for students who need more support to be successful with the learning intent. The scaffolding strategies will include Kagan structures, visual aids, along with repeated instruction and practice.

Teachers will implement Daily Five so students can have time to practice reading during the school day. Teachers will give feedback to students to move learning forward, which allows students to build on errors. Teachers will explicitly teach and repeatedly expose students to academic vocabulary throughout the content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SWDs struggle with retention. They require visual aids and repeated practice to create and maintain mental images to retrieve for later use.

Research shows that the more students read within their zone of proximal development, their reading ability and vocabulary development grows.

Feedback to and from the teacher allows the students to become independent learners.

Explicit instruction on vocabulary and repeated exposure to vocabulary increases students vocabulary knowledge. Increased vocabulary knowledge increases reading comprehension. Reading comprehension directly correlates to success in other content areas.

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.

In July, the leadership team met to decide on strategies to implement during the 2023/24 school year.

Person Responsible: Nicole Owens-Braggs (nowens-braggs@ecsdfl.us)

By When: July 11 and 12, 2023

During preplanning, the SIP will be shared with teachers so that they can provide their input and will work collaboratively to decide what the strategies look like for their grade levels.

Person Responsible: Heather VanSickle (hvansickle@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2, 2023

During monthly faculty meetings, teachers will be retrained on Kagan structures. They will be reintroduced on how to naturally implement the structures within the curriculum.

Person Responsible: Theresa Restifo (trestifo@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Third Wednesday of each month.

Teachers will be reintroduced to using thinking maps throughout contents to support creating mental images for all students but particularly for students who may need this support.

Person Responsible: Susan Tapparo (stapparo@ecsdfl.us)

By When: September 20, 2022

Teachers will be trained on Daily Five. This training will help teachers to develop a systematic and accountable way for students to read independently.

Person Responsible: Theresa Restifo (trestifo@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

During weekly planning sessions, teachers will discuss academic vocabulary that students need to know. They will discuss and make a plan for how to explicitly teach vocabulary to students. They will also make a plan for repeated practice of concepts.

Person Responsible: Nicole Owens-Braggs (nowens-braggs@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly during the grade level PLCs.

Teachers will utilize the the Big M tiered support guides to intervene with gaps in math.

Person Responsible: Susan Tapparo (stapparo@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Teachers will be trained on the Big-M with tiered support during grade level PLCs by the end of August.

Teachers will be introduced to the daily practice in the math curriculum to use for math practice of current and past skills.

Person Responsible: Susan Tapparo (stapparo@ecsdfl.us)

By When: End of August.

#2. 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.

The school will continue to implement the program Capturing Kids Hearts to build a positive and inclusive school culture and environment. The program will promote success in the way teachers and students develop relationships in the school culture and environment. Through the program students and teachers learn how to interact with others during normal and challenging situation by following the developed social contract and using the hand signals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

One hundred percent of employed teachers will complete the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly faculty meetings will be held to get a gauge on how teachers are experiencing the working conditions.

Faculty leaders will openly discuss any issues arising to problems that can be addressed. They will present possible solutions to potential problems.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Owens-Braggs (nowens-braggs@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.)

Capturing kids hearts is an evidence program that supports building relationships between teachers, students and the community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When stakeholders feel connected to the school environment and to one another, they have the desire to work through potential issues.

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.

Teachers will be trained on the fundamentals of Capturing Kids Hearts and how it relates to the school-wide behavior plan.

Person Responsible: Samantha Town (stown@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 2, 2023

#3. 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.

SWDs have a higher percentage of 5+ absences (35%) and ODRs (8%) than the overall school population in the areas of 5+ absences (25%) and ODRs (6%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD 5+ absences will decrease to 30% by the completion of the school year. The average ODRs for SWDs will decrease by 3% points to 5%.

Monitoring:

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

The students with 5+ absences will be monitored through data collected from the FOCUS parent portal. SWDs will be identified. The administrative team and school counselor will contact parents and utilize the district resources such as the School Social Worker. An administrator and the counselor will review the data twice a month to review the data changes. Parents will be notified of student absence days, student academic progress, and current progress toward year-end goals. The notification will include the student's academic average and grade level average.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Tapparo (stapparo@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.)

Positive feedback to parents and students about improvement in attendance will be monitored through a school-wide initiative titled Be a H.E.R.O. We will utilize the badge system in FOCUS Positive Behavior Rewards. The class and students will be recognized for good attendance through our electronic bulletin boards located around the school building.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates a positive response to a desired area of change shows a decrease in student absences.

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

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

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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****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 plan will be posted on the school's webpage. We will have a Title 1 meeting to discuss the data and the 2023-2024 goals. Goals will be posted in conference rooms and will be referenced.

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))

*Pleasant Grove Elementary webpage: [Escambiaschools.org/pges](https://escambiaschools.org/pges)

*Parents will be invited to the school for parent conferences. Student data will be discussed with the parents/guardians. Accommodations will be made for the parent to attend a conference electronically.

*Each student will receive a personalized goal sheet for the school year. The sheet will include the student's starting data and a goal for the year in the areas of ELA and Math. The goal sheet will be shared with students, teachers, and the family. The sheet will be updated as PMs are administered.

*The school will hold at least three family events during the school year to support the academic areas of Reading, Math, and Science. The engagement activities will be centered on providing resources for the parents and students to increase academic achievement. Our goal is to improve students academically while building community at our school.

*Information to parents will be disseminated through flyers, School Messenger, the digital school sign, and our Facebook page.

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))

During each school day, time is set aside in the master schedule for WIN (What I Need) time and for extra support in math and science. WIN time will meet the needs of all students by providing time for tiered support or enrichment.

The teaching staff will be participating in weekly PLCs centered on standards based instruction and understanding their students' data.

Our Inclusion support teachers and teacher assistants will be pushing into classroom to support SWDs with research based intervention and support curriculum.

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))

One of our SIP goals is to improve student attendance. The administrative team, school counselor and our district appointed school social worker will be working in conjunction with the Children's Home Society Navigator to reach out to parents concerning attendance. The Navigator will support the school social worker making home visits, and supplying personal items needed by the families in our school.

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))

Teachers, parents, and students may request counseling services. We work with Lakeview to recommend services outside of the school setting. Students seek out the guidance counselor to talk with when they are trying to manage life stressors.

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).

Teachers recommend students for behavior support. The parent and teacher work together to develop a behavior plan that will teach replacement behavior. The plan is reviewed every 6 to 9 weeks for effectiveness. If tier 2 level of support does not work, the team works together to develop a more intensive plan. The behavior analyst supports the team to develop an appropriate intensive behavior plan.

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))

The faculty and staff attend weekly PLCs. Proven instructional practices are shared and an analysis of data is conducted to determine if instruction is benefiting all students.

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))

N/A/

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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.

Yes