

Escambia County School District

West Pensacola Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

West Pensacola Elementary School

801 N 49TH AVE, Pensacola, FL 32506

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.

West Pensacola Elementary School is increasing life chances for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision for West Pensacola Elementary School is to be a community of learners that champion each individuals' worth and take ownership of their impact on the world.

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
Baker, Christine	Principal	
Tart, Candace	Assistant Principal	
Livingston, Audra	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Wolford, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
McVey, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Kaye, Kyle	Other	
Linton, Brittany	Other	
Fillingim, Virginia	Teacher, K-12	
Jewell, Debby	Teacher, ESE	
Lewis, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	
Skipper, Shelby	Teacher, K-12	
Sorrels, Tina	Teacher, K-12	
Pontier, Jacinda	Teacher, PreK	
Bare, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	

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.

The SIP was developed with the leadership team and after getting input from parents in multiple meetings at the end of the 2022-2023 school year and as the 2023-2024 school year begins.

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 reviewed monthly during leadership meetings. During the meetings data from benchmark and formative assessments will be used to diagnose trends that will guide revisions to ensure continuous improvement.

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	68%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	13	26	40	23	33	17	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	6	16	13	6	5	0	0	0	46	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	16	13	6	5	0	0	0	46	
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	5	7	5	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	15	10	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	15	12	0	0	0	40	
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	4	13	13	10	7	0	0	0	47

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	7	6	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	6

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	17	48	23	33	20	25	0	0	0	166	
One or more suspensions	0	6	4	11	4	4	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	7	19	25	6	0	0	0	63	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	10	2	5	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	22	15	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	25	20	0	0	0	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	20	25	40	22	18	0	0	0	144	

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	7	8	21	20	17	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	7	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	7

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	17	48	23	33	20	25	0	0	0	166	
One or more suspensions	0	6	4	11	4	4	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	7	19	25	6	0	0	0	63	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	10	2	5	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	22	15	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	25	20	0	0	0	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	20	25	40	22	18	0	0	0	144	

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	7	8	21	20	17	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	7	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	7

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40	48	53	37	51	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				48			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			38		
Math Achievement*	31	50	59	35	46	50	42		
Math Learning Gains				51			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			47		
Science Achievement*	54	52	54	45	52	59	34		
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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	154
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
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	19	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	27	Yes	2	1
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	36	Yes	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	46			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	35	Yes	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%
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	40			31			54					
SWD	21			28							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			26			46				4	
HSP	33			20							2	
MUL	74			59							2	
PAC												
WHT	42			33			63				4	
FRL	39			29			46				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	37	48	59	35	51	41	45					
SWD	40	61	64	40	38		31					
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	30	47	56	32	51	47	40					
HSP	46			23								
MUL	35	50		45	50							
PAC												
WHT	46	55		37	51		48					
FRL	37	53	55	33	50	42	44					

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	43	41	38	42	40	47	34					
SWD	43	27		33	21		17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	29		38	43		28					
HSP	33			33								
MUL	57			62								
PAC												
WHT	51	63		43	44		50					
FRL	40	38	38	40	42	58	30					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	49%	5%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	57%	-14%	58%	-15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	27%	44%	-17%	50%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	27%	51%	-24%	59%	-32%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	58%	-21%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	51%	3%	51%	3%

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.

Our overall math performance of 34% is the data component that is the lowest performing. This component was impacted by new curriculum, new standards, and a new assessment impacting the effectiveness of learning and instruction. This trend also mirrors the nationwide trend of a decline in math since the pandemic.

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

The ELA achievement in the SWD subgroup declined 21 percentage points. We had a large shift in our population that greatly reduced the number of students in this subgroup. West Pensacola also experienced inconsistent staffing with teachers that work specifically with this population.

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 achievement had a 23 percent gap when compared to the state. This component was impacted by new curriculum, new standards, and a new assessment that impacted the learning and instruction. This component has had a national decline trend.

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

The ELA proficiency improved almost 7 percentage points. Actions taken at the school that impacted this component were the use of specific interventions based on student need, we also added a resource teacher to specifically work on ELA interventions and assist in monitoring the ELA data. We adjusted our beginning of the year reading push from monitoring Accelerated Reader to monitoring and stretching for overall stamina. There was also a monthly reading challenge that increased independent reading by all learners.

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

Attendance continues to be an area of potential concern.

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

1. Math Achievement
2. SWD subgroup
3. Retention and Recruitment of faculty and staff
4. Positive School Culture/Climate as it relates to students (discipline, self-regulation)
5. ELA Achievement

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the areas of concern, teacher turnover and the ability to recruit and retain certified employees have had an impact on our achievement and learning gains. By bringing this area into focus we hope to decrease the turnover and increase the likelihood of employing certified faculty in all areas to ensure students are receiving the best instruction possible.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will have no turnover in core instructional positions during the school year and will retain 85% of the faculty and staff from the 2023-2024 for the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor satisfaction using a survey that will be given quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shelby Skipper (sskipper@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. Schools have a multitiered system in place that supports the behavioral practices—from the school-wide to the individualized levels (10 Keys to Behavior- Tier 1)
2. School decisions are guided by school-wide discipline data. (10 Keys to Behavior- Tier 1)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. According to 10 Keys to Behavior Practice Guide from The Meadow Center, having a multitiered system in place that supports the behavior practices from the school-wide to the individualized levels shows a positive impact on student achievement, behavior, and attendance. (Tier 1)
2. According to 10 Keys to Behavior, school decisions guided by school-wide discipline data show a positive impact on student behavior and attendance. (Tier 1)

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 PBIS resource teacher and principal will gather data using a survey during the first 2 weeks of August. This will be compared to a mid-year survey given by mid-January and an end of the year survey given mid-April/early May. The survey will gauge satisfaction and stress level related to the job.

Person Responsible: Shelby Skipper (sskipper@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Before August 31st Between October 10th and October 31st Between April 15th and May 1st

The PBIS resource teacher and guidance counselor will provide training to faculty and staff on de-escalation strategies for students and themselves by the end of October.

Person Responsible: Shelby Skipper (sskipper@ecsdfl.us)

By When: October 31st

Based on calls for assistance, the PBIS resource teacher will provide targeted support for faculty and staff requesting the greatest amount of support related to classroom management/relationships/behavior.

Person Responsible: Shelby Skipper (sskipper@ecsdfl.us)

By When: The 2nd Wednesday of each month beginning November

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**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.

We will target our Hispanic subgroup because their Federal Index was 35 at the last reported assessment period.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Hispanic subgroup will receive an overall Federal Index of 41% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student progress on formative and summative assessments bi-weekly and during progress monitoring periods.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Baker (cbaker@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. Conduct monthly data chats with teachers identifying progress of hispanic students on summative and formative assessments. Develop action plans for students based on data (Practice Guides)
2. Teachers conduct monthly data chats with hispanic students to develop goals and discuss progress with hispanic students (Practice Guides)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. According to the practice guide, by discussing data monthly with teachers regarding the subgroup and creating plans we will ensure that we are targeting students in their area of need and responding in a timely manner and increase achievement.
2. According to the practice guides, when students understand their data they take ownership of their progress and increase achievement.

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.

Review subgroup data from Schoolnet, STAR, iReady, AR. Based on data create intervention plans for subgroup.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Every 3rd Friday

Resource teacher will provide training on research-based interventions for ELA. Math PD on B1G-M will be provided on 9/20 and that will be utilized for interventions.

Person Responsible: Audra Livingston (alivingston@escambia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Every 3rd Friday based on data

Co-plan with teachers weekly (Tuesday or Thursday depending on the grade level) to ensure interventions are being planned.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdf.fl.us)

By When: K-2 on Tuesday, 3-5 on Thursday. This occurs each week.

Based on data, resource teacher and math TSA will provide support for teachers with less than 75% of the subgroup hitting their target.

Person Responsible: Audra Livingston (alivingston@escambia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Administrative team will walk core content weekly and provide immediate written feedback in regards to instructional cues/practices observed in the room. Resource Teacher and math TSA will walk bi-weekly for teachers receiving targeted support.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdf.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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.

Increasing student engagement is vital to improving attendance, proficiency and growth rates amongst all subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will be measuring student engagement by monitoring the average daily rate of attendance with a goal of 92% and through the use of an engagement rubric with a goal of 4 out of 6. We also have an average daily attendance goal of 91%.

Monitoring:

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

Average daily attendance is monitored weekly through our SIS, Focus. Classroom engagement is monitored through weekly walkthroughs conducted by school-based administrators using the established engagement rubric.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Baker (cbaker@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.)

The leadership will establish school-wide protocols for attendance and engagement (Marcia Tate, Kagan, Talk Moves, PBIS). The protocols will be monitored by data review and class walks. Teachers and students will receive feedback about attendance and engagement on a weekly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing ADA ensures students are present for instructional periods. (Attendance Works)

Implementing Kagan cooperative learning has been shown through studies to increase student engagement. An increase in engagement has also been shown to reduce unnecessary absences and tardies.

PBIS has shown to increase student engagement and sense of belonging. Both of these factors play a role in unnecessary absences, tardies and content retention.

Marcia Tate is a resource that provides instructional strategies that has been proven to help engage the brain and motivate students to learn.

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.

Review average daily attendance from the end of the year and review the engagement rubric and the goal for both with the faculty and staff.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Provide PD on Marcia Tate, Kagan (for those not already trained), and Talk Moves

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: September 1, 2023

Monitor engagement through daily walk-throughs.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: August 28, 2023

Provide support to teachers based on the data from walk-throughs. Begin CST for students with attendance deficit. CST will occur weekly and will be led by the guidance counselor and Navigator.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Beginning September 18, 2023

#4. 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.

Instructional practices as related to math and how it affects learning in math fluency and computations.

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 32.3%(proficiency*) on the 2023 FAST to 50% proficiency as reported by the 2024 FAST PM3 school wide.

Less than 20% of students in all grade levels will receive a failing grade in math.

Monitoring:

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

Reflex and iReady math will be monitored weekly.

Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs to calibrate lens for math expectations.

Grades K-2 will analyze results of STAR math, iReady Diagnostic and district assessments.

Grades 3-5 will analyze results of STAR math, iReady Diagnostic, FAST and district module assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Baker (cbaker@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. Strengthen differentiated Tier I instructional delivery through the use of the Math Frameworks and B1G-M Instructional Guides (Practice Guide 26 Assisting struggling students in math- elementary)

2. Instruction during the intervention should be explicit and systematic (Practice Guide 26 Assisting struggling students in math- elementary)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. By strengthening the differentiated Tier I delivery we can ensure proficient students continue to progress and reduce the number of students that require MTSS.

2. By ensuring intervention is explicit and systematic, we will be ensuring that it is aligned with what students need and moves them through the standards in a meaningful way.

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.

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)

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning September 4th, 2023

Utilize the BIG M to identify instructional strategies to support benchmark aligned instruction and tiered strategies to support differentiation.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Beginning September 21, 2023 and continuing through the end of the school year.

Provide professional development through the mathematics department focused on the shifts of the benchmarks and the implementation of instructional practices to allow students to learn the content of the benchmark. The professional development will be followed up with classroom walks with the administration and/or the math department to identify the shifts and implementation with feedback given to the teachers.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: PD will occur on 9/20/23 and walks will begin the following week.

Coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, word problems and student discourse. Coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible: Christine Baker (cbaker@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Will begin on 9/4/2023 and continue until the end of the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

32% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

50% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

60% 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 73% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 52% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 44% 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.

Baker, Christine, cbaker@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?

West Pensacola Elementary School 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
<p>Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-</p> <p>Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.</p> <p>Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.</p> <p>Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.</p> <p>Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.</p> <p>Action Step 3: Assessment</p> <p>Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.</p> <p>Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.</p> <p>Action Step 4: Professional Learning -</p> <p>We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:</p> <p>Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees</p> <p>Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading.</p>	<p>Baker, Christine, cbaker@ecsdfi.us</p>

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

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

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

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

Throughout the school year, SIP progress is regularly shared and discussed through the School Advisory Council. Regardless of membership status, all stakeholders are invited to attend School Advisory Council meetings.

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

<https://www.escambiaschools.org/wpes>

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. Four academic Family Nights are scheduled to build the capacity of families in Language Arts, Math, SEL and Science. Teachers will share strategies that can be used at home. Teachers send weekly information home to parents regarding their child's academic and social progress. This year our PTA is partnering to hold monthly activities to build capacity with families in the areas of Math and ELA.

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/wpes>

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)

This year the school has increased the number of classroom teachers in third grade to address the sharp decline in progress and proficiency in that grade level since the pandemic. We have also worked to add three qualified teacher assistants to provide additional classroom support to help with engagement and small-group instruction. The school has designed a plan that includes professional development and guided planning for Math in order to address that area of focus.

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

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

Title I, Part D: Resources are provided for parents whose children are enrolled in Neglected & Delinquent programs.

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

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

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

All students participate in school-wide efforts to address areas outside of academic subject matter. Students that are struggling to meet standards are provided opportunities for small group academic and counseling with the guidance counselor or the LMHC that is on campus twice each 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).

All students are held to school-wide expectations and have opportunities to earn through a token economy. Students that struggle with behavior are referred to MTSS and are provided differentiated plans and small-group instruction to increase their ability to use strategies and increase their success with these skills.

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 will attend training provided by Marcia Tate on brain-based engagement strategies. These strategies will be implemented in all grades and contents. Teachers of Math will be attending training on the use of the B1G-M for planning and how to use their data from formative and summative assessments to guide their planning. We also have planned professional development on how de-escalate students AND how to de-escalate ourselves when dealing with students in crisis. This is particularly impactful for ESE students/service providers and our teachers in is a direct attempt to ensure retention of staff.

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 student's progress and where they fall in the expectation of being Kindergarten Ready.

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No