

Escambia County School District

Reinhardt Holm 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	11
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	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

Reinhardt Holm Elementary School

6101 LANIER DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

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.

Holm Elementary school will promote and enhance learning and highest student achievement through collaborative efforts of all stakeholders and will make a positive difference in the lives of students by preparing them for lifelong learning. We believe an effective rapport between school and home should exist to develop a sense of responsibility toward self, family, school, community, and country.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In a positive, collaborative and student centered learning environment teachers at Reinhardt Holm Elementary will facilitate students who will engage in interactive, rigorous standards based learning.

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
Fina, Terri	Principal	Supervision and evaluation of faculty and staff PD for staff Planning with grade levels Daily walk thrus Analyze data and make course adjustments when necessary Develop master schedule and budget Class placement of students
Fetsco, Shana	Assistant Principal	Supervision and evaluation of faculty and staff PD for staff Planning with grade levels Daily walk thrus Analyze data and make course adjustments when necessary Transportation Textbooks Discipline
McNair, Shanaue	Other	Analyze data Plan with grade levels Daily class walk thrus PD for staff Support ELA and math coaches
Kendall, Julie	Other	Analyze data Planning with grade levels PD for staff Monitor RTI data, schedule and attend RTI meetings
Kuhlman, Sabra	Instructional Coach	Analyze data Math planning with all grade levels Support grade levels PD for staff Coaching teachers in area of math
Montminy, Kalyn	Instructional Coach	Analyze data ELA planning with all grade levels Support grade levels PD for staff
Hill, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher Analyze data Planning for grade level
Richardson, Jamila	Teacher, ESE	ESE Inclusion Support for K and 1 Analyze data Planning for ESE students

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mosley, Keely	Other	Analyze data Monitor AR program Implement and run school wide reading plan/program

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.

We have four SAC (School Advisory Council) meetings per year. The SAC group consists of teachers, non-instructional faculty, parents and community members. The initial SAC meeting for the school year is held during the first quarter and goes over the following items: Title I budget, School-Family Compact, Parent Family Engagement Plan and any other items related to our Title I program. We ask for input from all attendees on these topics as well as any other areas they bring up to improve our school.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP is monitored throughout the school year for all of our areas of focus. We then share out with parent and all stakeholders - faculty and staff, parents, community members throughout the year on the progress made on each goal in newsletters as well as during SAC meetings. If we have to change our path we let all stakeholders know the change and why we made the change.

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	77%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	17	27	23	23	15	18	0	0	0	123	
One or more suspensions	2	2	7	4	4	7	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	4	3	1	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	7	3	3	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	5	10	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	17	0	0	0	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	3	5	6	2	14	0	0	0	31	

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	1	3	5	6	2	14	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	17	27	23	23	15	18	0	0	0	123	
One or more suspensions	2	2	7	4	4	7	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	4	3	1	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	7	3	3	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	5	10	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	17	0	0	0	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	3	5	6	2	14	0	0	0	31	

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	1	3	5	6	2	14	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	19
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*	40	48	53	32	51	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				42			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			50		
Math Achievement*	43	50	59	36	46	50	38		
Math Learning Gains				42			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			33		
Science Achievement*	64	52	54	39	52	59	64		
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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	194
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
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	40	Yes	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	4	
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	70			

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	45			

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	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	39	Yes	3	

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	40			43			64					
SWD	31			33			73				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			31			61				4	
HSP												
MUL												

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	61			67			83				3	
FRL	36			39			62				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	32	42	57	36	42	41	39					
SWD	16	28	36	23	52	50	22					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	36	50	29	31	40	29					
HSP	55			55								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	45		56	76							
FRL	29	41	55	34	38	38	37					

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	45	42	50	38	37	33	64					
SWD	20	25		12	25		15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	53	55	33	41	36	56					
HSP	50			50								
MUL	42			8								
PAC												
WHT	65	30		61	30		92					
FRL	41	44	55	35	37	33	61					

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	42%	49%	-7%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	57%	-18%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	44%	-3%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	58%	-14%	61%	-17%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	47%	-7%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	51%	13%	51%	13%

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.

Traditionally Holm Elementary scores lower in ELA than math - proficiency for ELA in 21/22- 32 %, math - 36% and for the 22/23 school year proficiency for ELA - 42% and math - 46%. Also the three subgroups Holm has been monitoring and will continue to monitor are Students with Disabilities, African American students and Economically Disadvantaged students. These students continue to perform below the 41% mark in both ELA and Math. Holm struggles to hire qualified , experienced teachers especially for state tested grade levels. The past several years we have had teachers new to Holm and/ or new to teaching in both our 4th and 5th grades.

We also struggle to hire qualified ESE teachers and fill all support positions such as our inclusion support teacher assistant positions.

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

Holm's scores looking at proficiency comparison from 21/22 to 22/23 increased in ELA, Math and science.

ELA went from 32% proficiency in 21/22 to 42% in 22/23. Math went from 36% proficiency in 21/22 to 46% in 22/23. Science went from 39% proficiency in 21/22 to 64% proficiency in 22/23.

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.

Holm's ELA compared to the state is 11.9% lower than the state average.

Holm's math compared to the state is 11.8% lower than the state average.

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

Science went from 39% proficiency in 21/22 to 65.1% proficiency in 22/23. We departmentalized fifth grade and hired an experienced strong science teacher for the 5th grade science classes.

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

Three subgroups continue to be areas of concern for Holm and they are our students with disabilities, our economically disadvantaged students and our African American students.

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

Our top priority will be moving our economically disadvantaged subgroup to 41% as well as our African American subgroup to 41% in our Federal Index. Our next priority will be to maintain at least 41% proficiency in ELA, math and science and then we will focus on moving our Students with Disabilities subgroup up to 41%.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Culture and environment relating to positive behavior intervention and support will be an area of focus as well as average daily attendance including tardies. In 2021-22 Holm had 10 referrals in Focus with 326 referrals in RTIB. This past year 2022-23 RTIB was not used and we had 204 referrals in Focus with 56 of the referrals in our African American population and 16 in our Students with Disabilities population. Our average daily attendance was 90% and all three of our low-performing subgroups were close to that average with Students with Disabilities at 90.5%, Economically Disadvantaged students at 89.5% and African American students at 90%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want our overall student population as well as all three of our low-performing subgroups to have 93% or higher average daily attendance and reduce tardies as well as decrease behavior referrals.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance as well as tardies will be monitored through Focus.

Referrals will be monitored through Focus.

Child study meetings will monitor both academics and attendance.

Behavior will also be monitored through the MTSS process if needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri Fina (tfina1@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. MTSS process for Tier 2 and 3 - With Tier 2 minor interventions are put into place for absences and/or behavior such as a check in system with a mentor. In Tier 3 we develop more intensive strategies for students such as a behavior plan and goals that are monitored by staff. With attendance issues at this level we would involve parents and students with a contract on attendance.

2. parent messaging strategy - This strategy is a person calling home when there is an absence or tardy in addition to the automated call out.

3. According to What Works Clearinghouse "Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom" it is important to:

1. Identify the specifics of the problem behavior and conditions that prompt and reinforce it
2. Modify classroom learning to decrease behavior problems
3. Teach and reinforce new skills
4. Draw on relationships with professionals and family

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. The MTSS process for Tier 2 and Tier 3 attendance and behavior issues will help us identify issues at school we can address to increase student attendance and decrease student behavior issues.

2. From the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance a study was completed on the impact evaluation of parent messaging strategies on student attendance. Findings from the study showed:

The two approaches to basic messaging were similarly effective at reducing chronic absences, but one

approach to intensified messaging was better than the other for certain students. The intensified messaging that involved school staff directly texting parents reduced the chronic absence rate in the spring more than the other more automated approach.

3. According to What Works Clearinghouse "Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom" the four steps listed above show moderate to strong improvement in reducing student behavior problems.

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.

Administration, guidance counselor, faculty and staff will monitor absences as well as tardies and complete a call log on family contacts within Focus.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be an ongoing activity throughout the entire school year.

The guidance counselor will conduct child study meeting on students with chronic absences and tardies.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be an ongoing activity throughout the entire school year.

We will utilize the MTSS team to identify student behavior needs and match them to interventions. The RTI/MTSS Coordinator is being paid for out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible: Julie Kendall (jkendall@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be an ongoing process throughout the entire school year.

We will utilize our behavior technician to work with teachers and students in identifying behavior issues and helping implement interventions identified by MTSS team. The behavior technician is being paid for out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be an ongoing activity throughout the school 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.

English Language Arts instruction will be a focus for Holm Elementary in the 2023/24 school year. In 2021/22 schoolwide ELA achievement was 32% proficiency in grades 3 - 5 and went up to 42% proficiency in the 2022/23 school year. However we have three subgroups: Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged students and African American students, while they are moving up still continue to score lower than the overall student population. Students with Disabilities 16% proficiency in 21/22 and 25.8% proficiency in 22/23. Economically Disadvantage students 29% proficiency in 21/22 and 36.4% proficiency in 22/23. African American students 24% proficiency in 21/22 and 32.6 % proficiency in 22/23.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall proficiency went up from 21/22 at 32% proficiency to 42% proficiency in the 22/23 school year. We want to make sure we maintain 41% or higher in ELA for the 23/24 school year. However the three subgroups we have been monitoring while they are moving up still are below the overall student population and below the 41% federal index we want. We want these three subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged students, African American students and Students with Disabilities federal index scores to increase to at least 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Data from core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, reviewed and broken down by grade level, teacher and ESSA groups.

The Leadership team will conduct weekly ELA walkthroughs for both the core block and the intervention block and will review school wide data after significant assessments. The Leadership Team will monitor the progress of students and share findings with appropriate grade level teachers. After reviewing the data the team will discuss any adjustments to instruction and/or provide professional development to improve the effectiveness of instruction in both the ELA block and the ELA intervention block.

The RTI Coordinator and the MTSS team will meet and analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students and provide recommendations to improve results for students in Tier 2 and/or Tier 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri Fina (tfina1@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.)

Holm will focus on the following best practices outlines in the Escambia Public Schools K - 12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan during core instruction and additional reading intervention.

- * Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge (promising evidence).
- * Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words (strong evidence).
- * Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies: question generation, visualization, text structure, self-monitoring(strong evidence). This is defined as intentional mental actions during reading that improves reading comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Comprehension hinders a student when the student lacks the ability to apply decoding strategies, vocabulary and lacks background knowledge. As text increases in complexity from grades K-3 to grades 4 and 5, students need explicit instruction in reading comprehension strategies such as visualization, questioning, making inferences and retelling. Embedding instruction in how to use intentional mental actions to improve comprehension will help students navigate the more complicated texts they encounter in grades 4 and 5. The practices selected are based on the Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade, and Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten through 3rd grade. Fourth and fifth grade students needing intervention in foundation skills and/or comprehension benefit from instruction aligned to the recommendations outlined in these What Works Clearinghouse practice guides for K - 3. These strategies align to the Escambia Public Schools K - 12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

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.

The school Literacy Leadership Team will develop a schoolwide reading plan.

Person Responsible: Kalyn Montminy (kmontminy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This plan will be developed by the end of the first 9 weeks of the school year.

Weekly planning with grade level, literacy coach and a member of the Leadership team. Teachers will be paid \$20 an hour to plan beyond the school day 2 days a week for one hour each day. This extra time will be paid for through our Title I funds.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly planning will be ongoing throughout the entire school year.

We will utilize the MTSS team to identify student needs and match them to interventions based on the Escambia Public Schools intervention decision tree. The RTI/MTSS Coordinator is being paid for out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible: Julie Kendall (jkendall@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The MTSS team will meet throughout the school year to address student needs.

The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs during the core literacy block and intervention blocks, and provide feedback to teachers regarding implementation of planning and fidelity of the intervention.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Walkthroughs will be ongoing throughout the entire school year.

The leadership team will analyze data collected from classroom walkthroughs and assessments with particular attention to ESSA subgroup performance and will conduct data chats, and design remediation and reteach opportunities.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be an ongoing activity throughout the entire school year.

Provide a literacy coach to support teachers and increase teacher knowledge both in subject area as well as instruction techniques. The literacy coach is being paid for out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The literacy coach will be supporting teachers throughout the entire school year.

#3. 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.

Math instruction will continue to be a focus for Holm Elementary in the 2023/24 school year. In 2021/22 schoolwide math achievement was 36% proficiency in grades 3 - 5 and went up to 46% proficiency in the 2022/23 school year. However we have three subgroups: Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged Students and African American Students who's scores are moving up but continue to be lower than the overall student population as well as below the 41% federal index we want. Students with Disabilities 23% proficiency in 21/22 and 41.9% in 22/23, Economically Disadvantaged Students 34% proficiency in 21/22 and 41.1% in 22/23, African American students 29% proficiency in 21/22 and 34.5% in 22/23.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall math proficiency went up from 36% in 21/22 to 46% in 22/23. We want to make sure we maintain at least 41% proficiency or higher in math for the 23/24 school year. The three subgroups we have been monitoring are not where the overall student population is nor at the federal index of 41%. We want these three subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged students, African American students and Students with Disabilities federal index scores to increase to at least 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Data from core math instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, reviewed and broken down by grade level, teacher and ESSA groups.

The Leadership team will conduct weekly math walkthroughs for both the core instruction block and intervention block and will review school wide data after significant assessments. The Leadership Team will monitor the progress of students and share findings with appropriate grade level teachers. After reviewing the data the team will discuss any adjustments to instruction and/or provide professional development to improve effectiveness of instruction for both the math core block and intervention block. The RTI Coordinator and the MTSS team will meet and analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students and provide recommendations to improve results for students in Tier 2 and/or Tier 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri Fina (tfina1@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.)

Holm will focus on the following practices outlined in the According to Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades found on What Works Clearinghouse during core math instruction and additional math intervention time.

- * Provide students with explicit systematic instruction (strong positive effect).
- * Teach students precise mathematical language (strong positive effect).
- * Teach students to use mathematical representation to understand math concepts (strong positive effect).
- * Provide students explicit word problem instruction (strong positive effect).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing systematic instruction during intervention to develop students' understanding of mathematical ideas and teaching clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language will help students effectively communicate their understanding of math concepts. Using a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations will support students' learning of math concepts and procedures. Use of a number line to facilitate the learning of math concepts and procedures will build an understanding of grade level material and prepare students for advanced math. Providing deliberate instruction on word problems will deepen students' math understanding and support their capacity to apply mathematical ideas.

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.

Provide a math coach to support teachers and increase teachers knowledge. The math coach will be paid out of Title I funds.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The math coach will be supporting teachers throughout the entire school year.

Weekly planning with grade level, math coach and a member of the Leadership team. Teachers will be paid \$20 an hour to plan beyond the school day 2 days a week for one hour each day. The extra time will be paid for through our Title I funds.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Weekly planning will be ongoing throughout the entire school year.

We will utilize the MTSS team to identify student needs and match them to interventions. The RTI/MTSS Coordinator is being paid for out of ESSR funds.

Person Responsible: Julie Kendall (jkendall@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The MTSS team will meet throughout the school year to address student needs.

The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs during core math instruction and intervention blocks, provide feedback to teachers regarding implementation of planning and fidelity of the intervention.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Walkthroughs will be ongoing throughout the entire school year.

The leadership team will analyze data collected from classroom walkthroughs and assessments with particular attention to ESSA subgroup performance and will conduct data chats, design remediation and reteach opportunities.

Person Responsible: Terri Fina (tfina1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This will be an ongoing activity throughout the entire school year.

The leadership team will be working with Mathnasium to develop and provide a math family night to increase families understanding of math concepts and to expand their capacity to assist their student in the area of math.

Person Responsible: Sabra Kuhlman (skuhlman@ecsdfl.us)

By When: This math family night will be held in November.

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. 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:

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

Literacy Assessment.

48% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

48% 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 56% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 60% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 58% on the 2023 FAST.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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

Monitoring**Monitoring**

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

To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.

- a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
- b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and the percent of students meeting benchmark on

the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom. (See FOCUS report)

c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart. (See Amira)

d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.

2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Florida Literacy Practice Profiles.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fina, Terri, tfina1@ecsdfl.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?

Reinhardt Holm Elementary uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/ Language Arts Program (CCRP)

The district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how Into Reading meets Florida’s definition of evidence-based. The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.

In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.

Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school’s administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and Rtl teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

Rationale:

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

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

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with

a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

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

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<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>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>	<p>Fina, Terri, tfina1@ecsdfi.us</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.

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

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))

Our Family Engagement Plan will be available on our school's webpage - Reinhardt Holm Elementary escambiaschools.org as well as available in a hard copy at parent request.

We will build positive relationships with our families and other community stakeholders by:

- *Inviting families and community to our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings
- * Holding an annual meeting for families to explain the Title I program and the rights of parents to be involved
- * Provide flexible parent meeting times to be offered during the day or after school as well as virtually
- *Provide materials and training to parents to help them support their child's learning at home
- * Communicate with our families in a variety of ways including flyers, school website, newsletters, marquee, phone calls, conferences, etc.
- * Providing information in a format and language parents can understand.
- * Having parent/teacher conferences to share the progress of each student and review any appropriate data available.

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)

Holm plans to strengthen our academic program in ELA through our core blocks as well as intervention times by focusing on evidence based strategies that include: teaching students academic language skills, teaching students to decode, analyze words parts and write and recognize words and teaching students to use reading comprehension strategies.

We plan to strengthen our math program both in our core block and intervention block by focusing on evidence based strategies that include: having explicit systematic instruction, teaching precise

mathematical language, using mathematical representation to understand math concepts and having explicit work problem instruction.

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 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))

Holm Elementary will be providing professional developing on a couple of items to increase our positive environment and culture. All staff will be trained on "Morning Meetings" to encourage students to build community within the classroom. All staff will also be trained on the Satchel Pulse computer based social skills program we will begin using this year to more effectively address students social/emotional needs.

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))

NA

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).

Holm Elementary utilizes the MTSS/RTI process for students identified as struggling with academics or behavior. Our RTI coordinator monitors students already in the process as well as students brought to her attention by teachers, staff or data. The committee meets on a regular basis to review all students in

the process, if they are making progress with the interventions in place or if the interventions need to be intensified. Parents are invited to participate in all steps of this 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))

Holm Elementary will continue training on best practices for ELA and math, as well as data analysis , along with using D.E.A.R. (Drop Everything and Read) time, Calendar Math, use of adopted curriculums and other areas that may be identified by the Leadership team throughout the school 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.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No