Fort Mccoy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Fort Mccoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Fort McCoy School, the staff works together in an environment of mutual respect and understanding toward the common goal of preparing students for a lifetime of learning, productive work, and responsible citizenship by serving the learning needs of the community in both traditional and innovative ways.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fort McCoy School, working together as partners with the total community, will prepare students for the future. We aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging that includes meaningful instructional strategies and differentiation for all students. Our educational program engages each student by linking curricular content to previous knowledge and experience while remaining exciting enough to promote further exploration of new ideas. We recognize that we cannot reach our goals without the hard work of our Fort McCoy students, parents, and our community.

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
Surdam, Jordan	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The Principal supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Woerner, Angela	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Elder, Dossella	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Hunt, Leona	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach/Content Area Specialist coaches teachers on effective literacy strategies and interventions to increase and improve learning outcomes for the school.
Rivera, Mary	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.
McQueen, Tiffany	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
Taschenberger, Mary	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
Mills, Meghann	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.

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.

Fort McCoy School involves stakeholders in the development of the School Improvement Plan through our School Advisory Council (SAC). During SAC meetings, schoolwide data is reviewed, progress toward current SIP goals is shared, and feedback is solicited for SIP development in the upcoming school year.

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 effective implementation of the SIP and its impact on increasing the achievement of students meeting the State's academic standards will be monitored in a variety of ways. Monitoring will occur through bi-weekly Leadership meetings, quarterly data reviews, district instructional reviews, and classroom walkthroughs. The plan will be revised, as needed, based on data from classroom walkthroughs, district and state assessments, and district instructional reviews.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	17%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No

RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	20	50	49	52	38	36	51	89	86	471
One or more suspensions	10	8	14	13	18	22	51	47	32	215
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	6	2	5	0	2	7	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	4	16	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	35	35	65	47	69	279
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	41	37	43	37	43	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	16	28	28	35	35	65	47	69	326

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	5	17	28	22	16	22	69	112	99	390

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	3	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3

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	45	38	30	33	31	33	50	78	61	399
One or more suspensions	9	11	10	14	27	15	50	66	55	257
Course failure in ELA	19	32	17	9	7	12	3	17	36	152
Course failure in Math	20	23	13	3	9	3	22	26	7	126
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	27	34	37	72	50	258
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	33	35	29	70	58	258
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	21	30	18	10	14	14	34	46	53	240

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	45	38	30	33	31	33	50	78	61	399
One or more suspensions	9	11	10	14	27	15	50	66	55	257
Course failure in ELA	19	32	17	9	7	12	3	17	36	152
Course failure in Math	20	23	13	3	9	3	22	26	7	126
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	27	34	37	72	50	258
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	33	35	29	70	58	258
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	21	30	18	10	14	14	34	46	53	240

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	38	32	53	38	32	55	35		
ELA Learning Gains				42			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			32		
Math Achievement*	37	36	55	36	34	42	36		
Math Learning Gains				50			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			46		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	34	26	52	34	32	54	30		
Social Studies Achievement*	50	41	68	54	43	59	48		
Middle School Acceleration	40	59	70	37	39	51	49		
Graduation Rate		19	74		27	50			
College and Career Acceleration		0	53		48	70			
ELP Progress		39	55		54	70			

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	12	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	34	Yes	2	
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	35	Yes	3	

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	25	Yes	3	3
ELL	10	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	38	Yes	2	

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	38			37			34	50	40			
SWD	8			12			5	8			5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	30			41			18	46			4	
MUL	50			42							2	
PAC												
WHT	38			36			36	49	42		6	
FRL	32			31			25	47	26		6	

| **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	38	42	41	36	50	56	34	54	37			
SWD	9	31	33	8	35	48	10	25				
ELL	10			10								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	35	42	33	36	53	50	19					
MUL	62	64		52	48							
PAC												
WHT	37	41	43	36	50	58	35	53	38			
FRL	32	40	38	31	48	53	27	44	27			

| **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	35	41	32	36	44	46	30	48	49			
SWD	10	30	28	13	36	40	3	22				
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	35	41	45	40	57	64	15	33				
MUL	70	69		50	50							
PAC												
WHT	33	40	30	35	43	46	30	47	54			
FRL	28	38	31	30	43	44	24	46	47			

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	36%	49%	-13%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	37%	2%	47%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	30%	38%	-8%	47%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	48%	-17%	58%	-27%
06	2023 - Spring	37%	36%	1%	47%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	39%	5%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	54%	-10%
07	2023 - Spring	36%	41%	-5%	48%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	48%	-12%	59%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	53%	-25%	61%	-33%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	45%	-3%	55%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	28%	37%	-9%	44%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	43%	-8%	51%	-16%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	44%	16%	50%	10%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	66%	-17%

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.

Science achievement showed the lowest performance in the 22-23 school year. When disaggregating the data, 5th grade Science achievement showed an increase of 7% from the previous year, while 8th grade Science achievement decreased by 7%. The greatest contributing factor to the decrease in 8th grade achievement is the correlation to ELA achievement in this grade level. Only 30% of the 8th grade students demonstrated proficiency on the FAST ELA assessment in the 22-23 school year, a mere two percentage points higher than 8th grade Science achievement. Due to the critical thinking, processing, and problem solving required in order to fully demonstrate understanding of many of the higher order science concepts, students must be proficient readers.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline overall was Social Studies achievement, which fell from 54% in 21-22 to 50% in 22-23. When looking at the school grade history, Social Studies achievement has been at 48 or 49% overall since 2019, except for the 2021-2022 school year. Student engagement contributed to the decline, as our 22-23 7th grade class received the highest number of office discipline referrals, resulting in a loss of instructional time, which impacts achievement.

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.

The greatest gap in achievement is found in 8th grade Science proficiency. The state average was 47% proficient and Fort McCoy School's 8th grade Science achievement was 28%. This is a gap of 19%. Again, this gap correlates to the 8th grade student achievement in ELA, which was also 17% lower than the state average in 2022-2023. Since 2015, Science achievement has correlated very closely with our ELA achievement. We must continue to immerse students in the critical thinking process and increase reading comprehension and fluency in order to increase both Science and ELA achievement.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement overall was Mathematics achievement, increasing 5% from the previous school year (36% to 41%). When disaggregating the data, the greatest improvements were noted in grade 5 (increased proficiency 8%) and grade 8 (increased proficiency by 18%). In 5th grade, Math teachers participated in collaborative planning, with a focus on formative assessment data-driven instruction. In 8th grade, there was a substitute in place during a majority of the 21-22 school year. Without a certified teacher, achievement dropped drastically. In the 22-23 school year, we secured a Certified teacher, paired the teacher with a district-based Math coach, and achievement increased significantly.

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

Attendance is a major area of concern, given the high percentage of our students in each grade level identified as chronically absent. Overall, 45% of our students met the criteria for chronic absenteeism in the 22-23 school year. When digging deeper, many of the chronically absent students are also students that are non-proficient in core subject areas.

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

The highest priorities are ELA Achievement, Science Achievement, Attendance, and performance of all ESSA subgroups performing below the 41% threshold by content area.

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.

Based on 22-23 data, 45% of our students are identified as chronically absent, meaning they missed more than 10% of the school year. Many of the students with chronic absenteeism are also non-proficient students identified in our lowest quartile and ESSA subgroups, including Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Hispanic students, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

If Fort McCoy School develops and implements tiered attendance supports and incentives at a schoolwide (Tier 1), small group (Tier 2), and individual student (Tier 3) level, then the percentage of students identified as chronically absent will reduce by 5%. If student attendance improves, student achievement will increase, creating a supportive and fulfilling environment with learning conditions that meet the needs of all students.

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

Attendance will be monitored at a Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 level bi-weekly during our Multi-Disciplinary Team meetings and our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports team meetings. We will monitor attendance by grade level, classroom, and individual students as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Fort McCoy School is part of the Florida Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Project. Our team, which includes Administration, teachers, family engagement liaison, Deans, Counselors, School Psychologist, and our Social Worker, have been trained in implementing PBIS strategies and interventions with fidelity to increase student success. According to the Center on PBIS, "Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based/three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools that support everyone – especially students with disabilities – for success."

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

As a school chosen to be part of the Florida Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Pilot Project, our team not only receives training, but also receives on-site coaching and monitoring. This training and on-site coaching will provide us with the necessary supports to ensure we are implementing the intervention with fidelity.

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.

Monitor attendance bi-weekly by grade level, class, and individual student as needed.

Person Responsible: Angela Woerner (angela.woerner@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur bi-weekly during MDT/PBIS team meetings.

Develop Tier 1 schoolwide plan for attendance improvements.

Person Responsible: Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023; Updates as needed based on data

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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.

Fort McCoy School has maintained a school grade of a C since 2015, but fell to a D in 2021. In 2022, Fort McCoy improved to a C once again. Fort McCoy School earned 43% of the total points in 2022, and based on current 2022-2023 data, Fort McCoy earned 41% of the points, a 2% decline. In 2023, Fort McCoy students showed an increase in Math achievement (+5%) and Acceleration (+4%). Fort McCoy School remained constant in the area of Science Achievement (34%) from 2022 to 2023. Fort McCoy demonstrated a slight decline in ELA Achievement (-1%) and Social Studies Achievement (-4%). The increases we have seen across the year correlate with collaborative planning, but our implementation continues to develop. Currently, Fort McCoy School has four ESSA subgroups falling below the 41% threshold, including Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, Hispanic Students, and Students with Disabilities. Standards-aligned instruction guides the lesson planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning in academic and elective content areas.

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

If teachers are provided with collaborative planning opportunities, with a focus on task alignment and formative assessment, then student achievement will increase by 3% in all areas, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking and End of Course assessments.

ELA Achievement – 37% to 40%
ELA Learning Gains – 42% to 45% *2022 data
ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 41% to 44% *2022 data
Math Achievement – 41% to 44%
Math Learning Gains – 50% to 53% *2022 data
Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 56% to 59% *2022 data
Civics Achievement – 50% to 53%
Acceleration – 41% to 44%
ESSA Subgroups below 41% will improve by 3%

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

A school administrator will participate in collaborative planning. Quarterly classroom walkthrough data, as well as District and state assessment data (such as DPMAs, Benchmark Assessments, CSMAs, FAST, MTSS, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will engage in peer observations to deepen understanding regarding lesson implementation after planning. Teachers will utilize formative assessment data to drive instruction with administration monitoring implementation through regular walkthroughs. Subgroup data will be monitored regularly through data digs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Collective teacher efficacy is defined as the belief that teachers can more positively impact the learning of their students if they work as a team. Collaborative planning, with a focus on task alignment, and formative assessment, will positively impact collective teacher efficacy, thus improving student achievement.

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

Collective teacher efficacy not only influences productive teaching behaviors, but also results in a deeper implementation of school strategies, increased teacher leadership, high expectations, and receptivity to new ideas (Donohoo, 2018). John Hattie's 2018 updated list of factors related to student achievement identified collective teacher efficacy as the new number one factor in increasing student achievement, with an effect
size of 1.57.

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.

Coordinate with a neighboring middle school to provide quarterly opportunities for middle school teachers to collaborate with other teachers with the same grade level/content area. Due to the small population of our middle school, we only have one core subject area teacher per grade level, making true collaboration difficult.

Person Responsible: Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Administrators and instructional coaches will be present during collaborative planning opportunities to facilitate conversations and focus on planning (B.E.S.T. benchmarks, BigM, item clarifications, learning task alignment), implementation (high-yield instructional strategies), and assessment (formative assessment, Benchmark Assessment, DPMAs, EOCs, and FAST).

Person Responsible: Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Utilize walkthrough data and classroom observation data to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of collaborative planning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-weekly during Leadership Team Meetings

Facilitate ELA collaborative planning and engage in coaching cycles as needed, based on data collected from classroom observations.

Person Responsible: Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

School improvement funding allocations are reviewed and feedback solicited during School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings quarterly throughout the school year. Funding allocations and resources are also reviewed during the Annual Title I Meeting, where all stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate and share feedback and suggestions.

School funding allocations are selected based on the review of student achievement data of student learning ESSA subgroups, analysis of teaching quality, scheduling of instructional time, and implementation of supportive interventions for students in need. Intervention plans are supported by resources selected as approved interventions based on the district-adopted plans.

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

Currently, the percentage of students in grades K-2 not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 41% (Kindergarten 2022-2023), 41% (1st grade 2022-2023), and 47% (2nd grade 2022-2023). This data is based on Star Early Literacy or Star Literacy PM3 assessments.

In grades K-2, we found that many of our non-proficient students struggled with high frequency words. Research shows that the first 100-200 high frequency words make up 50% of the words in school texts. On average, 13 words account for 25% of the words read by students. The "Magic 13" are: a, and, for, he, in, is, it, of, that, the to, was, you.

At Fort McCoy School, we aligned our phonics instruction through the University of Florida Literacy Institute with high frequency words students are expected to learn and master each grading period for each grade level (grades K-2). Students are monitored on their mastery of the words throughout the quarter and school year. Students are expected to master reading at least 80% of the assigned high frequency words for their grade level each quarter, and cumulatively throughout the school year.

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

Current data indicates that a majority of students in grades 3-5 are reading below grade level expectations. In 2022-2023, 56% of 3rd graders, 69% of fourth graders, and 64% of fifth graders scored below a Level 3 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
In our data analysis, we found that many of our non-proficient students lacked the fluency skills to read and access a grade level text. Reading research strongly supports fluent reading as necessary for adequate reading achievement across the K-12 continuum. Research also shows that fluency accounts for 25% to over 50% of the difference in reading comprehension.
At Fort McCoy School, we have implemented a differentiated instructional practice for students to have repeated reading practice daily, and thus improve fluency. We will be tracking student progress and the correlation to performance on district and state assessments.

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

If K-2 students demonstrate mastery of reading grade level, high frequency words at 80% or better, then student achievement and learning gains will increase by 3%, as measured by PM1 to PM3 (Kindergarten) or PM3 2023 to PM3 2024 for students in grades 1-2.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If 3-5 students increase fluency rates while reading connected text, then student achievement and learning gains will increase by 3% in ELA, as measured by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST).

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.

We will monitor the areas of focus as follows.
In grades K-2, students will be assessed quarterly on a set list of high-frequency words that align with the University of Florida Literacy Institute phonics instruction. The assessments will be cumulative, and students will be expected to master 80% of the words each quarter. Ongoing monitoring will provide us with data that will drive instruction, collaborative planning, and intervention/enrichment supports.
In grades 3-5, student fluency will be assessed weekly, using connected text and based on a student's individual need and placement. Teachers will bring fluency scores to collaborative planning weekly for us to chart progress, monitor student improvement, and plan instruction based on the data gathered.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.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?

Both practices of mastering high-frequency words and increasing reading fluency align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan, as well as the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. We will utilize Read Naturally as a supplemental reading program designed to improve reading fluency in grades 3-5. This program is identified as "promising" by the state of Florida.

Each of these practices/programs will be monitored through collection of student data weekly (fluency) and quarterly (high frequency words).

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?

Research shows that the first 100-200 high frequency words make up 50% of the words in school texts. On average, 13 words account for 25% of the words read by students. The "Magic 13" are: a, and, for, he, in, is, it, of, that, the to, was, you. If students in grades K-2 master at least 80% of the grade level high frequency words, student achievement and learning gains will increase.

Reading research strongly supports fluent reading as necessary for adequate reading achievement across the K-12 continuum. Research also shows that fluency accounts for 25% to over 50% of the difference in reading comprehension. If students in grades 3-5 increase fluency rates of connected text, student achievement and learning gains will increase.

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
Create grade level high frequency word lists, aligned to the district-adopted phonics program (UFLI) for students in grades K-2.	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us
Teachers will provide students with opportunities to practice reading high frequency words in connected text through UFLI.	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us
Teachers and LCAS will monitor student mastery of grade level high frequency words quarterly. The data will be utilized for instructional planning and intervention/ remediation/enrichment needs.	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us
Prepare fluency materials for all students and teachers in grades 3-5.	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us
Teachers will monitor student fluency weekly. We will chart student progress during grade level collaborative planning time.	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.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 Fort McCoy School Improvement Plan will be made available in both English and Spanish through our school web site, www.marionschools.net/fms, and in our front office for families. All stakeholders are regularly apprised of the SIP and progress toward goals through quarterly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, the Annual Title I meeting, and family engagement opportunities throughout the school year.

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))

Fort McCoy School builds a positive school culture and environment by regularly communicating with all stakeholders throughout the year, including teachers, students, families, volunteers, business partner, and
school advisory council. Communication occurs through a variety of means including social media, Skylert calls, emails, our school web site, individual phone calls, face-to-face engagement opportunities,

etc. We understand that our stakeholders play an essential role in school success and ensuring equity for all. Family engagement events and meetings will be scheduled in a flexible format (ex: different days and times) and when necessary, meetings and/or events will be duplicated at different times/days allowing for maximum family and community participation. English language translators will be available for our parents as needed through our bilingual staff members. We will also provide school event documents in English and Spanish. Our school facility is ADA accessible. If support is needed to accommodate a disability, appropriate arrangements will be made by the school. We will utilize our Family Engagement Liaison to maximize communication with students and families in regards to attendance, academics, behavior, etc. As a PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Supports) school, we have schoolwide expectations, focusing on positive behaviors and reinforcements. We offer parent engagement opportunities throughout the year to build parent and family capacity in supporting their child's education.

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))

Fort McCoy School will strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum through guided and facilitated collaborative planning. Collaborative planning will focus on creating standards/benchmark based instructional lessons that implement high-yield instructional strategies to engage students by meeting the breadth and depth of the standard.

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))

The Fort McCoy School Improvement Plan is created in coordination with various programs and resources. These include visits from the Title I District Parent Resource Center/Van to support families with resources to support learning initiatives at home. Additionally, as a FANS school (Fitness and Nutrition in School), we focus on educating all students on the importance of a healthy lifestyle and diet, to support brain and heart health.

Our Guidance Counselors also work to employ support from programs for students in need, such as Hospice grief counseling. Our Counselors and Family Engagement Liaison work within the community to connect families to additional resources (Kimberly's Center, United Way, etc.) to support the overall health, social-emotional wellbeing, and achievement of all students.

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))

Our Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) meets bi-weekly to review, discuss, monitor, and plan for specialized support services, school-based mental health services, counseling, mentoring, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. Our Elementary teachers complete the BESS, which is utilized to identify and plan for additional student supports. Teachers, staff, and parents/guardians are able to complete a MDT Referral for any student of concern.

Our Elementary and Middle School teachers implement Tier 1 social emotional learning through our adopted curriculum - Caring School Community (ELEM) and Habitudes (Middle). We also offer Digital Citizenship to teach elementary students about internet safety in grades Kindergarten and third.

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))

As an AVID-certified school, we implement schoolwide initiatives to create awareness of post-secondary options, as we prepare students for college and career-readiness. Our school also offers coursework that allows students to obtain an industry certification in the areas of Culinary Arts and Agriculture.

Our Middle School Guidance Counselor utilizes My Career Shines with 7th and 8th grade students to provide students with the opportunity to identify and link interests to potential occupations, explore relevant post-secondary education providers, research local, state, and national employment trends, view potential salaries, and set goals for life after high school.

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).

Through our participation in the Florida Positive Behavior Intervention Supports pilot program and our Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) processes, Fort McCoy School prevents and addresses problem behavior and interventions at a tiered level. Through our partnership with Florida PBIS, we work to prevent occurrences of problem behaviors through data-based decision making that is focused on building social and other functional competencies, creating supportive contexts, and providing research-based interventions to students and staff. In the 22-23 school year, Fort McCoy worked with the FLPBIS team to create an interconnected systems
framework to support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of the students.

During MDT meetings, we examine data at a Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 level, determining action plans, interventions, and student response to interventions.

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))

A professional learning plan has been developed for the 23-24 school year. Aligning with our District Strategic Plan: Achieve 2026, the school-based professional learning plan will allow participants to receive differentiated training in a variety of areas, including collaborative planning, PBIS data and action planning, high-yield instructional strategies, student engagement, literacy, and building positive relationships with students.

Additionally, Fort McCoy School works to retain and recruit effective teachers through successful onboarding and induction. Experienced teachers new to Fort McCoy are paired with a buddy teacher to support them as they learn the way of work of the school. Teachers new to the profession have been assigned a mentor teacher to support them throughout their first year. We also have a Lead Instructional Talent Developer (ITD) that schedules monthly Cougar Cohort meetings with all teachers within their first 3 years of teaching to address topics specific to needs surveys completed by the participants. Topics in the past have included classroom management, data analysis, and how to conduct a parent-teacher conference. Our Literacy Content Area Specialist works directly with new teachers with collaborative

planning, coaching cycles, and learning walks, in order to increase effective teaching practices within the classroom.

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))

We schedule vertical collaboration opportunities at least twice per year with our Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Teachers. This opportunity allows teachers to collaborate and share ideas, needs, and how to best support learning as the students progress from early childhood education to the elementary school program.

Families of Pre-Kindergarten students identified as ESE have the opportunity to participate in an articulation meeting with the receiving school to ensure a successful transition.

Our district also offers Kindergarten Kickstart in the summer for Pre-Kindergarten students to have an opportunity to spend some time on campus, meet the teachers, and learn more about the school setting in advance of starting Kindergarten.