**Escambia County School District**

# Warrington Elementary School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

## Warrington Elementary School

### 220 N NAVY BLVD, Pensacola, FL 32507

### www.escambiaschools.org

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

| Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI) |
|---|
| A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%. |

| Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) |
|---|
| A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years. |

| Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) |
|---|
| A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: <br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; <br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; <br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or <br>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.**

Provide an environment that creates opportunities for all students to achieve their highest potential while building a foundation that will allow all students to be life-long learners. Our mission statement supports our school's message: Better and Brighter Every Day.

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

Warrington Elementary stands out in the community simply due to its location on Navy Boulevard. Our vision is that we would also stand out in our community as a positive and well respected learning environment that supports our students, families, and the community at large.

## 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 |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Rose, Timothy | | Oversee all functions of the school in an effort to create a culture of learning for all students. |
| Maloney, Katie | | Support the principal in the overall functions of the school. |
| Harvey-Thomas, Sylvia | | Support teaches in the development and implementation of curriculum in classrooms and to assist with planning in ELA and Math in grades K-5 and in Science in grade 5. |

**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.

Stakeholders are given opportunity during the school year to provide feedback on the Parent and Family Engagement Plan. This feedback is used to determine changes that might be necessary within the school to allow for more envolvement from all stakeholders.

**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 will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs to determine that effective classroom instruction is occuring, and to provide PD for teachers, greade levels, and schoolwide in areas that are not meeting the school, district, and state expectations for increasing student achievement and closing learning gaps.

## 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** | 80% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 100% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | Yes |
| **ESSA Identification** *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* 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 | 15 | 31 | 27 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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. | 10 | 15 | 20 | 18 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

**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 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |

**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 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**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 | 10 | 27 | 18 | 25 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 9 | 19 | 21 | 25 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 14 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

### 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 | 10 | 27 | 18 | 25 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 9 | 19 | 21 | 25 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 14 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

## 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* | 18 | 48 | 53 | 24 | 51 | 56 | 23 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 41 | | | 21 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 43 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 18 | 50 | 59 | 33 | 46 | 50 | 30 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 49 | | | 36 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 38 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 15 | 52 | 54 | 38 | 52 | 59 | 26 | | |
| 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 | 17 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 67 |
| 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 | 42 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 291 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

## ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 11 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 13 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 28 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| FRL | 16 | Yes | 4 | 1 |

| 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 | 33 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | Yes | 3 | |
| HSP | | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 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 | 18 | | | 18 | | | 15 | | | | | |
| SWD | 14 | | | 10 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 14 | | | 15 | | | 9 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 28 | | | 28 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| FRL | 16 | | | 17 | | | 17 | | | | 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 | 24 | 41 | 53 | 33 | 49 | 53 | 38 | | | | | |
| SWD | 20 | 58 | | 14 | 38 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 22 | 33 | 38 | 30 | 40 | 38 | 23 | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 32 | 57 | | 33 | 63 | | 64 | | | | | |
| FRL | 23 | 38 | 53 | 30 | 48 | 53 | 33 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | 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 | 23 | 21 | 43 | 30 | 36 | 38 | 26 | | | | | |
| SWD | 0 | 33 | | 18 | 38 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 20 | 33 | 28 | 31 | 38 | 25 | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 26 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 22 | 22 | 46 | 31 | 37 | 42 | 26 | | | | | |

**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 | 20% | 49% | -29% | 54% | -34% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 57% | -23% | 58% | -24% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 18% | 44% | -26% | 50% | -32% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 15% | 51% | -36% | 59% | -44% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 58% | -24% | 61% | -27% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 10% | 47% | -37% | 55% | -45% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 15% | 51% | -36% | 51% | -36% |

## 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.**

The overall BLK subgroup showed the lowest performance at 14.3% with ELA at 17.6%, Math at 16.5% and Science at 8.7%. In addition, the SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance in Math at 11.1%. Unfortunately, the school was not fully staffed. Throughout the year, 5th grade had multiple substitute teachers and 3rd grade was only staffed for three out of four classrooms. One of the 4th grade teachers had intermittent leave without coverage due to a substitute shortage. All of these disruptions also increased behavior issues among the students which in turn decreased learning time for all.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a -22.8% drop. This is highly due to not having a 5th grade teacher for the entire school year.

**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.**

Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with a 39.4% difference. We are still trying to fill the gaps from loss of learning during the COVID years. This is very difficult to do when math in particular builds on skills learned from the previous years.

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

The white subgroup in ELA showed an increase of 3.3%. The employment of a reading resource teacher and a reading intervention teacher providing intensive small group instruction to students in the RTI process may have impacted this particular subgroup.

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

The absence indicator is an area of concern when looking at the EWS data. There is an increase in absences from Q1 to Q2 and then again from Q3 to Q4.

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

Decreasing absences and office discipline referrals, as well as increasing proficiency and learning gains in ELA, Math, and Science (proficiency only) are among our highest priorities for the upcoming school year.

**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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the average percent of students absent for 5+ days was 44.6%. This rate of absenteeism had a significant impact on the average daily attendance (ADA) for the school as follows:
Quarter 1: 90.48% ADA
Quarter 2: 85.60% ADA
Quarter 3: 87.67% ADA
Quarter 4: 85.65% ADA
This equates to the average daily attendance rate being below 90%. Students with poor attendance will lead to reduced instructional time, drastically impacting student learning. Therefore, improving student attendance is a critical area of focus for the 23-24 school year.

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

The Average Daily Attendance for each quarter will increase to at least 90% for the school's total enrollment, as well for the following ESSA subgroups: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students, Students with Disabilities, and Black students.

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

Absentee data will be run weekly for Warrington Elementary. The data will be shared with the leadership team and the navigator to discuss ongoing absence rates throughout the year. The administration will run a weekly report showing students with three or more absences for the week and will share the report with the navigator who will contact those families to inquire about the absences.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Katie Maloney (kmaloney@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. Incentivize attendance for students.
2. Navigator (social worker) supports parents to overcome barriers effecting student absentee rates.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to "Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools" by the United Stated Education Department, low attendance can critically impact student learning. By incentivizing attendance and utilizing the navigator, parents and students will be supported to reduce the number of absences in order to maintain and accelerate learning.

**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 leadership team, including the navigator, will review absences of students.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Maloney (kmaloney@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Weekly

An incentive will be awarded on Fridays for the classes who have the highest ADA (at or over 90%). On a quarterly basis, students with perfect attendance will participate in a Perfect Attendance Party.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Maloney (kmaloney@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Weekly and Quarterly

Parents will be provided an opportunity to meet with the Assistant Principal to discuss how chronic absenteeism is impacting student learning outcomes.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Maloney (kmaloney@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Quarterly

The navigator and district social worker will work with families of students who reach 5 unexcused absences to identify any potential barriers. The navigator will align resources and support to increase student attendance.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Maloney (kmaloney@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** As needed

The Assistant Principal will conduct a call out to parents/guardians addressing attendance rates broken down by grade level.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Maloney (kmaloney@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

The NGSS Science Assessment 2023 data yield a 15.2% proficiency score. This is a 22.8% decrease from 2022. The current proficiency score shows deficiencies in the following subgroups. Students with Disabilities (25%), Economically Disadvantaged (17.2%), and African American /Black (8.7%).

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

Science proficiency will go from 15.2% to 41% or higher on the 2024 NGSS Science Assessment. Students with Disabilities will increase at least 16 points to get from 25% to 41% or higher. Economically Disadvantaged will increase at least 23.8 points to get from 17.2% to 41% or higher, and African American /Black will increase 32.8 points to get from 8.7% to 41% or higher.

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the Science goal will be district created probes, unit tests, and quarterly progress monitoring. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sylvia Harvey-Thomas (sharvey-thomas@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. Increase student engagement in learning (tier 1)
2. Strengthen the multi-tiered system of supports for all students (tier 1)
3. School leadership ensures that teachers have a shared understanding of the curriculum and standards across the grades. (tier 1)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. The rationale for this strategy is evidenced-based research by John Hattie and Robert Marzano that overt direct instruction, student engagement with the content, and teacher feedback have a high effect size.
2. According to 10 Key Policies and Practices for All Schools, when multitiered systems are in place to support the academic and behavioral progress of all students, it allows educators to quickly intervene with students who are struggling to be successful, this having positive results on student achievement.
3. According to 10 Key Practices for Assessment in Schools, when school leadership ensures that teachers have a shared understanding of the curriculum and standards across the grades, it results in improved instruction. This vertical alignment of content and instruction throughout the grades leads to more effective communication among teachers and improved instruction school-wide.

**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.

Professional development will be given on the use of the embedded hands-on activities and labs contained in the 2023-2024 Spark Science ECSD Guided Lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Sylvia Harvey-Thomas (sharvey-thomas@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

The leadership team will analyze data collected in the classroom walkthroughs and district benchmark assessments to facilitate data chats with teachers and proved coaching when needed.

**Person Responsible:** Sylvia Harvey-Thomas (sharvey-thomas@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

Teachers will have common planning periods to identify additional areas of support based on the current data to enhance the learning of all students, such as providing reteaching and/ or enrichment opportunities.

**Person Responsible:** Sylvia Harvey-Thomas (sharvey-thomas@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

Teachers will incorporate labs and/or hands-on activities at least weekly into the curriculum. These activities will require direct instruction and immediate teacher feedback to students. The curriculum coordinator will support this effort with example labs/activities and training on implementation.

**Person Responsible:** Sylvia Harvey-Thomas (sharvey-thomas@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Weekly

## #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.

Achievement in Math has not reached 41% proficiency for the past 3 years and shows deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessment: Students with Disabilities (11.1%), Economically Disadvantaged (17.6%), and African American/Black (16.5%).

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

Math proficiency will go from 18.6% (proficiency*) on the 2023 FAST to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, and Economically Disadvantaged. Math proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%.

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the Math goal will be unit assessments, STAR/Fast progress monitoring, and iReady. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, enrichment, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Timothy Rose (trose@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. Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies. (tier 1)
2. Teach students how to use visual representations. (tier 1)
3. Mathematical Language: Teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts. (tier 1)

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit word problem instruction proved to have a moderate positive effect size on student performance.
2. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit mathematical representation proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance.
3. According to Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit mathematical language proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance.

### 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

<table>
<tr><td><strong>Action Steps to Implement</strong><br>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.</td></tr>
</table>

The leadership team will analyze data from screening and progress monitoring assessments (STAR, FAST, iReady, Progress Learning, Quartely Assessment) in order to identify trends and provide professional development addressing deficits and then determine next steps for instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

Following professional development and planning, the school leadership team will do class walkthroughs to look for implementation of the professional development and planning in order to provide feedback to the teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Weekly

Review assessment data every two weeks and hold data meetings to identify students in need of intervention, and determine who will provide the intervention(s) which will then be monitored through RtI meetings and walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Biweekly

Warrington Elementary will be using iReady daily lessons for regular monitoring of progress. iReady reteach lessons will be used to remediate standards not yet mastered. In addition, the Savvas series provides a reteach component that will be used for remediation.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** on-going throughout the 23-24 school year

Weekly planning by grade-level will be occur weekly, with a benchmark focus, utilizing the B1G-M and the MTRs. PD will be provided by the School Leadership Team and/or District Content Specialist and TSAs. These PDs will be provided as needed as indicated by data.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** planning to occur weekly; PD to occur on an as needed basis during the 23-24 school year.

Utilize the BIG M to identify instructional strategies to support benchmark aligned instruction and tiered strategies to support differentiation. Utilize the MTR's (Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning) to engage students in discussing mathematical thinking and reasoning.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** weekly during planning; evident through instruction provided during classroom walkthroughs

**#4. 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.

Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency for the past 3 years and shows deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 progress monitoring assessment: Students with Disabilities (18.5%), Economically Disadvantaged (21.3%), and African American/Black (17.6%).

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

ELA proficiency will go from 22% (proficiency*) on the 2023 FAST to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, and Economically Disadvantaged. ELA proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%.

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the ELA goal will be module assessments, STAR/Fast progress monitoring, and iReady. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, enrichment, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Timothy Rose (trose@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.)

Warrington Elementary will focus on the following best practices outlined in the Escambia County K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan during core instruction and additional reading intervention:

1. Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge (Tier 3)

2. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words (Tier 1)

3. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension (Tier 2)

4. Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies: question generation, visualization, text structure, self-monitoring, inference and retelling. This is defined as intentional mental actions during reading that improve reading comprehension. (Tier 1)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Comprehension is hindered when a student lacks the ability to apply decoding strategies, vocabulary, and background knowledge. Furthermore, as the text increases in complexity from grades K-3 to grades 4 - 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 in grades 4-5 navigate more complicated texts.

The practices selected are based on the recommendations of The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Foundational Skills to 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 foundational skills and/or comprehension benefit from instruction aligned to the recommendations outlined in the What Works Clearinghouse practice guides for K-3. These strategies align to the Escambia County 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.

K-3 teachers will participate in the district's High Quality Reading Project (i.e. utilization of 95 Percent Group programs) to increase teacher knowledge and provide evidence-based foundational skills instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Maloney (kmaloney@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Weekly

The Literacy Leadership Team will develop a schoolwide independent reading plan to ensure students are reading and making connections to text daily.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Maloney (kmaloney@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Annually

The RTI Coordinator and MTSS team will identify student needs and match them to interventions based on the ECPS ELA Intervention Decision Tree.

**Person Responsible:** Sylvia Harvey-Thomas (sharvey-thomas@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs during the literacy and intervention blocks in order to provide feedback to teachers with a specific focus on the ESSA subgroups.

**Person Responsible:** Timothy Rose (trose@ecsdfl.us)

**By When:** Weekly

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

Funding allocations for Title I funds are based on survey 3 poverty data. Schools receive these allocations in the spring and work with Title I and the level directors to determine how those funds are utilized. Title I schools also receive additional funding for low income students to support parent involvement. UniSIG allocations are based on school grade and overall Federal Index rates and are received in late summer. The schools work with the School Transformation Office (STO) and level directors to determine the usage of these funds to maximize impact on student achievement. Both Title I and UniSIG are aligned so there are no resource

duplications between these two main school improvement funding sources. The Human Resource Department works with Budgeting, Finance, Title I, STO, and Executive staff to review staffing to ensure schools in need have staffing that reflects the need of the school. Title I, UniSIG, Reading Allocation, ESSER, and SAI funding sources are utilized to add supplemental positions to meet the needs of schools and align to state and district goals. School Improvement funding allocations are also utilized to pay staff to attend planning sessions and professional development sessions with the Professional Development Department and STO based on input from BSI and the district. The district identifies resources for coaching and planning support through the level directors, School Transformation Office, Title I, and Professional Development Department. Schools are tiered based on need including school grade, overall federal index, graduation rates, and ESSA subgroup data. Supplemental resources in addition to the district purchased core resources are reviewed based on the school need and approved for purchase utilizing school improvement funding and SAI funding. The district has also begun to utilize Canvas as the LMS to help support resource allocation to include benchmark aligned lessons, professional development, and content training for schools. Additional support that is identified by quarterly meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
67% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
64% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
72% 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 84% on the 2023 FAST.
Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 67% on the 2023 FAST.
Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 77% 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.

Rose, Timothy, trose@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?

Warrington ES 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 RtI 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 |
|---|---|
| Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-<br>Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.<br>Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.<br>Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.<br><br>Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-<br>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.<br>Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.<br><br>Action Step 3: Assessment<br>Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.<br>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.<br><br>Action Step 4: Professional Learning -<br>We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:<br>Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees<br>Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.<br>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<br>The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading. | Rose, Timothy, trose@ecsdfl.us |

# 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: https://www.escambiaschools.org/wes, as well as the schools Our Title I Family page: https://www.escambiaschools.org/domain/1302

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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

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

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is accessible from our school's website:
https://www.escambiaschools.org/domain/1302

**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))**

Warrington Elementary has created specific Areas of Focus for instructional practices and differentiated learning supports in ELA, Mathematics, Science. Warrington has created an Area of Focus to increase the culture of the school, specifically relating to Early Warning Systems, in order to increase the quality of learning.

Title 1 funds have been used to employ two Remedial Teachers. Their role is to work with students in small groups to help close learning gaps by teaching missing prerequisite skills that have been identified

by student progress with grade level benchmark assessments, FAST PM measures, and i-Ready progress.

Students who have been identified as Gifted have class once a week with a gifted endorsed teacher to work on developing skills that reach beyond the regular curriculum.
Students who are meeting grade level expectations are afforded the opportunity to advance academically through i-Ready Reading and Math self-paced and teacher assigned lessons.

**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.

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))**

Counseling and school-based mental health services are available at the school by the school counselor individually or as a group. Services are also available at the school by a Lakeview counselor who is on site twice a week, with a signed consent form from a parent. Mentors are placed with students based on recommendations from administration, parents and teachers, depending on the number of mentors available.

**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).**

RTI/MTSS Coordinator will meet with teachers to identify students who need additional support (academically) and create a plan for support. The support plan is then monitored through data collection and reviewed for next steps. Additionally, school admin will create and monitor additional small groups for intervention.

The PBIS Coordinator and school counselor will meet with teachers to identify and create a plan to

support behavioral needs and emotional needs of students. The support plan is then monitored through data collection and reviewed for next steps.

**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))**

Teachers and staff have the opportunity to participate in professional learning based on their needs or the recommendation of their evaluator by signing up in the Professional Development System (TalentEd) at the district level.

At the school level, professional learning opportunities are provided individually through coaching and collectively as grade level groups or faculty and staff as a whole. Additional professional development will be scheduled based on needs presented throughout the school year.

All staff will have the opportunity to participate in our Professional Learning Communities (PLC's). Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in weekly structured planning that could also lend itself to professional development opportunities. The teachers will have an opportunity to receive support from the District content specialists.

The school is using Title 1 funds for Professional Development. Teachers will take part in a book study focused on improving reading instruction for all students. They will read The Science of Reading and present/discuss information during four scheduled meetings.

Title 1 funds are also used to pay teachers to stay after school to review the data from FAST PM 1 and PM 2. The data is used to create small groups within classes that will address prerequisite skills that may be missing, and/or reteach grade level skills to students that have not reached mastery.

Professional development is also scheduled to address areas of need/concern that is evidenced through classroom walkthroughs. Thursdays during grade level common planning are reserved for this PD, and it is led by school-based personnel and subject area specialist from the district.

**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.