

Escambia County School District

# Scenic Heights Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Scenic Heights Elementary School

3801 CHERRY LAUREL DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

[www.escambiaschools.org](http://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.

At Scenic Heights, we strive to discover and develop the promise within each child. We, the staff of Scenic Heights Elementary School, consider the needs and interests of each child a priority.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that each child should acquire the fundamental skills necessary for participation in our democratic society. To insure success in our changing society, we challenge our students to pursue the ability to change and to cope with change.

### 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
Buck, Adam	Administrative Support	admin
Arnold, Kristin	Assistant Principal	admin
Currie, Megan	Administrative Support	admin
Etheredge, Jennifer	School Counselor	student services
Walters, Savannah	Other	student services

#### 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.

All stakeholders are involved in the SIP development process. The School Advisory Council meets monthly and is involved in the development of the SIP. The school leadership team meets monthly and is involved in the development and monitoring of the SIP plan and data.

**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 on a regular basis through monthly school leadership team meetings and School Advisory Council meetings.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	48%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	86%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	5	25	31	27	20	22	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	4	3	6	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	6	4	0	2	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	5	4	2	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	4	4	2	0	0	0	17

**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	5	8	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

#### **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	11	31	30	18	28	17	0	0	0	135	
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	1	4	8	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	4	7	2	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	7	18	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	15	20	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	6	6	12	8	0	0	0	34



**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	11	31	30	18	28	17	0	0	0	135	
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	1	4	8	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	4	7	2	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	7	18	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	15	20	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	6	6	12	8	0	0	0	34

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	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*	57	48	53	62	51	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				59			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			47		
Math Achievement*	61	50	59	66	46	50	66		
Math Learning Gains				53			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			32		
Science Achievement*	64	52	54	63	52	59	64		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	62	59	63			78		

\* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	43			
HSP	45			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	58			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	53			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	56			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	57			61			64					69
SWD	25			32			20				4	
ELL	27			41			32				5	69
AMI												
ASN	83			83			90				3	
BLK	41			43			46				4	
HSP	39			49			37				5	66
MUL	55			48			69				3	
PAC												
WHT	66			72			73				4	
FRL	47			55			51				5	86

**2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	62	59	55	66	53	51	63					63
SWD	26	36	37	28	46	45	12					
ELL	39	59	67	44	53	38	29					63
AMI												
ASN	82	69		78	65							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	40	43	33	54	41	33	29					
HSP	49	62	70	53	51	46	31					65
MUL	79	63		79	50							
PAC												
WHT	68	61	57	71	57	61	82					
FRL	53	57	54	56	47	51	65					61

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	65	51	47	66	44	32	64					78
SWD	37	20		27	20	18	29					
ELL	44	61	60	45	47		56					78
AMI												
ASN	88	82		85	73		83					
BLK	43	38	45	46	38		31					
HSP	45	45		50	53		67					76
MUL	84			77			80					
PAC												
WHT	73	49	30	75	42	23	72					
FRL	58	47	47	59	37	32	53					83

### 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	57%	49%	8%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	44%	10%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	51%	10%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	47%	14%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	51%	10%	51%	10%

### 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.**

According to FAST 2022-2023, ELA Proficiency (July 2023) was the lowest performance at 60.7%. The contributing factors to the decline in ELA proficiency (July 2023) were: A) FAST was a new assessment, B) students took the assessment on the computer vs paper/pencil, and C) the assessment was given in a 1 day session vs 2 day sessions in prior years.

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

According to FAST 2022-2023, ELA Proficiency (July 2023), showed the greatest decline from 62% to 60.7%. The contributing factors to the decline in ELA proficiency (July 2023) were: A) FAST was a new assessment, B) students took the assessment on the computer vs paper/pencil, and C) the assessment was given in a 1 day session vs 2 day sessions in prior 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 FAST 2022-2023, Science Proficiency (July 2023) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Scenic Heights scored 63.9% and the state average was 51%. Contributing factors were standards based planning & instruction and data tracking.

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

According to FAST 2022-2023, "Black/African American's" Science Proficiency (July 2023) had the greatest improvement from 29.4% to 46.2%. Contributing factors were standards based planning, off-campus Starbase immersive instruction, Study Island competition (Blue Ribbon Contest), & instruction and data tracking.

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

According to the EWS data from Part I, an area of concern is the number of SWD with 5+ absences per quarter.

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

1. SWD proficiency in ELA and math
2. "Black/African American"
3. The number students with 5+ absences per quarter

**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.

Generating clear, open communication with the parents of our students helps us avoid misunderstandings and remove feelings of mistrust. We celebrate personal achievement and good behavior by complementing

students. This helps them to feel that they are cared for individually. We have also established school norms that build positive values. In addition, we have set consistent discipline and behavior expectations. We continuously model the behaviors that we want to see in our school. The importance of school attendance is repeatedly emphasized to all students. The attendance of "students with disabilities" and "black/African American" will be monitored monthly. Rituals and traditions are created for our school that are fun for students, such as Cracking Up With Chloe, Did You Know, annual Red Ribbon Week and Literacy Week activities, Spring Carnival, and traditional last day of school countdown. All employees, families, students, and the community are the stakeholders that work together to promote a positive culture and environment at Scenic Heights Elementary.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

According to PMDR data for 2023-2024, the percent of students that are absent 5+ days will decrease from 25.1% to 20%. The percent of SWD with 5+ absences will decrease from 29.72% to 20%. The percent of "Black/African Americans" with 5+ absences will decrease from 21.4% to 20%.

**Monitoring:**

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

FOCUS attendance reports will be monitored every month.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Adam Buck (abuck@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.)

According to "Getting Students to School: Using Family and Community Involvement to Reduce Chronic Absenteeism", found on What Works Clearinghouse, recognizing good and improved attendance, engaging students and families, and provide personalized outreach is associated with improved attendance outcomes.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to PMDR data for 2022-2023, 25.1% of students were absent 5+ days. 29.72% of SWD were absent 5+ days and 21.4% of "Black/African American" students were absent 5+ days.

**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.

- Identify students with a history of severe chronic absenteeism
- School Counselors and Curriculum Coordinator will reach out by phone to speak with parents of chronically absent students to identify if any support is needed for the family and help parents understand and avoid legal consequences of extreme chronic absence.
- Teachers will engage chronically absent/tardy students in tracking their own daily attendance.
- Students will be recognized for excellent/good attendance and improved attendance.

**Person Responsible:** Adam Buck (abuck@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** monthly

**#2. 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.

Achievement in ELA proficiency (July 2023) shows deficiencies in Students With Disabilities (20.8%) based on the 2022-2023 PAST PM3 progress monitoring assessment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

ELA proficiency (July 2023) will go from 60.7% on the 2023 FAST to 62% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ELA proficiency (July 2023) for ESSA subgroups students with disabilities will increase to 30%.

The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between SWD and overall students will decrease by 20% going from 40 point gap on the 2022 ELA FSA to a 32 point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area focus will be monitored through FAST data, iReady data, Schoolnet data, and STAR 360 data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Adam Buck (abuck@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.)

Language for Learning

HMH Into Reading Tabletop Mini Lessons (Reading & English Language Development)

iReady Assigned Lessons and Tools for Instruction

Phonics Chip Kit

Direct instruction in the application of comprehension strategies

Phonological Awareness Lessons by 95% Group

Sonday Systems

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to "10 Key Reading Practices for All Elementary Schools", found on What Works Clearinghouse, all elementary students can become proficient readers if:

- Students are taught reading comprehension practices (e.g., paraphrasing information in text) and ways to flexibly apply these practices to reading and understanding a variety of literary and informational texts.
- Students are provided daily opportunities to incorporate learned reading practices (e.g., word meaning practices, comprehension practices) to read and understand a variety of texts.

- Teachers routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. These include:

- A. Build students' world/word knowledge so they can make sense of the text
- B. Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask/answer questions to better understand the text they read
- C. Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a section of text
- D. Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read

**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.

Data metrics to be used are FAST, iReady, Schoolnet, and Star360.

Stakeholders will be informed about data through grade level data chats.

Specific professional development will be provided through an iReady consultant.

Implementation will be monitored through data chats with admin team and classwalks by admin. Feedback from classwalks will be given teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Cox (mcox@ecsdfi.us)

**By When:** Monthly

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Achievement in ELA proficiency (July 2023) shows deficiencies in "Black/African Americans" (42.6%) based on the 2022-2023 PAST PM3 progress monitoring assessment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

ELA proficiency (July 2023) will go from 60.7% on the 2023 FAST to 62% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ELA proficiency (July 2023) for ESSA subgroups "black/African Americans" will increase to 50%.

The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between "Black/African Americans" and overall students will decrease by 44% going from 18 point gap on the 2022 ELA FSA to a 10 point gap or less on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area focus will be monitored through FAST data, iReady data, Schoolnet data, and STAR 360 dat

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Adam Buck (abuck@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.)

Language for Learning

HMH Into Reading Tabletop Mini Lessons (Reading & English Language Development)

iReady Assigned Lessons and Tools for Instruction

Phonics Chip Kit

Direct instruction in the application of comprehension strategies

Phonological Awareness Lessons by 95% Group

Sonday Systems

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to "10 Key Reading Practices for All Elementary Schools", found on What Works Clearinghouse, all elementary students can become proficient readers if:

- Students are taught reading comprehension practices (e.g., paraphrasing information in text) and ways to flexibly apply these practices to reading and understanding a variety of literary and informational texts.
- Students are provided daily opportunities to incorporate learned reading practices (e.g., word meaning practices, comprehension practices) to read and understand a variety of texts.
- Teachers routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. These include:

A. Build students' world/word knowledge so they can make sense of the text

B. Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask/answer questions to better understand the text they read

C. Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a section of text

D. Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read

**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.

Data metrics to be used are FAST, iReady, Schoolnet, and Star360.

Stakeholders will be informed about data through grade level data chats.

Specific professional development will be provided through an iReady consultant.

Implementation will be monitored through data chats with admin team and classwalks by admin. Feedback from classwalks will be given teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Cox (mcox@ecsdf.us)

**By When:** Monthly

**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.

**Title I Requirements**

### Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is available on: <https://www.escambiaschools.org/shes>

Members of the SAC are provided a copy of the SIP. A link to the SIP is provided in the school's weekly newsletter, "The Bulldog Bulletin". Translated copies of the SIP are made available in a variety of languages.

**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))

The Family Engagement Plan is available on: <https://www.escambiaschools.org/shes>

Scenic Heights will build positive relationships through a variety of back-and-forth communication (sharing good news not just bad news / social media / Class DoJo /

**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)**

Scenic Heights is continuously strengthening the academic program. Teachers are provided professional development for new instructional techniques as well as refreshers of existing techniques/programs. Instructional time is always protected with minimal interruptions.

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

N/A

### Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

Scenic Heights has 2 full-time guidance counselors and 1 Lakeview counselor (1 day/week).

**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).**

Scenic Heights has a full-time RTI Coordinator that oversees MTSS/RTI for all students. All teachers are trained annually.

**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))**

Employees are provided annual professional development in the use of iReady data, STAR data, FAST data, and Schoolnet data. This training allows teachers to gain valuable experience and expertise by tracking student data and seeing exactly which teaching methods are working and where there is room for improvement

**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