

Okaloosa County School District

Eglin 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Eglin Elementary School

200 GAFFNEY RD, Eglin Afb, FL 32542

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okaloosa County School Board on 8/28/2023.

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.

We prepare all students to achieve excellence by providing the highest quality education while empowering each individual to positively impact their families, communities, and the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We inspire a lifelong passion for learning.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Morris, Gwen	Principal	the instructional leader of the building and work collaboratively with teachers to improve instruction across the entire school

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.

Names and Titles of the School Performance Plan developers:

Gwen Morris - Principal (Laura Seegars - Previous Principal)
 Daren Everage - Assistant Principal (Amy Church - Previous Assistant Principal)
 Bridget Bishop, Lisa Parnell - Kindergarten Representatives
 Amy Anderson, Desiree Harmon - 1st Grade Representatives
 Crystal Cheeseman, Skylar McSheehy - 2nd Grade Representatives
 Suzanne Glass-Troutman, Solonia Bogar - 3rd Grade Representatives
 June Whiting-Cobb, Marilyn Jones-Urena - 4th Grade Representatives

Eglin Elementary School's School Performance Plan (SPP) is at the forefront of every department meeting, grade level meeting and faculty meeting. Each meeting, a piece of the SPP is addressed and discussed to provide input from teachers and monitored for fidelity and adjusted throughout the school year to meet the needs of both teachers, students, and all stakeholders. At the end of the school year, the SPP team re-addresses those needs and makes suggestions for next year's plan. A professional development needs survey is provided to teachers twice a year to ensure ongoing training, coaching, and support is in place. Embedded SPP initiatives and follow up help create the following year's plan. After the district's central message is given to the team, they add additional information to meet the needs and strengths of Eglin Elementary. The plan is then provided to all stakeholders for input and

adjusted accordingly.

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))

SPP grade level representatives were given an SPP survey in April/May 2023 and were asked to gather feedback and input from their grade levels about strengths and weaknesses from the 2022-2023 SPP initiatives, the Balanced Literacy and Math models, professional development goals for the 2023-2024 school year, questions, and ideas for implementation of the 2023-2024 central focus. During the initial SPP team meetings on May 15, 2023, school data and survey information was presented, reviewed and discussed. Both teams created the ELA and Math Targeted School-based Professional Development and Classroom Instruction based on the district guidelines, data, and teacher input. The assistant principal completed the Progress Monitoring section for the school-based Focus.

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-4
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	12	12	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	6	10	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	21	9	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	10	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	8	17	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	5	12	10	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	0	14	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	5	12	10	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	62	59	53	73	61	56	76		
ELA Learning Gains				80					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				77					
Math Achievement*	81	65	59	76	47	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				70					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54					
Science Achievement*		57	54		63	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					61	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
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	38	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	75			
HSP	49			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	74			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	57			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	75			
HSP	77			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	72			

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	62			81								
SWD	33			43							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63			89							3	
HSP	44			81							3	
MUL	68			84							3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	71			80							3	
FRL	53			72							3	

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	73	80	77	76	70	54						
SWD	35			41								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	72			78								
HSP	77	80		71	80							
MUL	67			73								
PAC												
WHT	71	76		78	67							
FRL	70	82		65	71							

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	76			78								
SWD	54			61								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	75			64								
HSP	67			76								
MUL	81			81								
PAC												
WHT	78			81								
FRL	72			81								

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
04	2023 - Spring	79%	67%	12%	58%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	65%	17%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	72%	13%	61%	24%

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.

Subgroup: Students with Disabilities (ESE)

According to Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Sub-Group Data, the subgroup we will focus on is Students with Disabilities (20%).

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

Subgroup: Students with Disabilities (ESE)

2021-22 English Language Arts Achievement (Level 3 and Above) - 35%

2022-23 English Language Arts Achievement (Level 3 and Above) - 20%

This show a decline of 15% from the previous year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA - ESE Subgroup

35% (Eglin) compared to 21% (State) from 2021-22

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

Mathematics Achievement

43% (Eglin) compared to 25% (State) from 2021-22

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

ESE teachers will notify general education teachers of ESE students and accommodations during preplanning and throughout the year when changes occur. Teachers will implement the IEP through standards-based instruction.

Teachers will address specific levels of performance for students with disabilities.

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

1. Added one additional unit to our ESE team which will provide additional push-in and/or pull-out time for students.
2. Additional Professional Learning provided to our staff via Staffing coaches.
3. MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Support): Provide additional training and support measures that will help staff quickly identify students' needs by providing targeted support and intervention. To further support the needs of students, we will provide Zones of Regulation (behavior) small group intervention and Zones of Regulation (academic) small group intervention. This framework develops awareness of feelings, energy and alertness levels while exploring a variety of tools and strategies for regulation, prosocial skills, self-care, and overall wellness.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Subgroup: Students with Disabilities (ESE)

Measurable Outcome:

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

School will score above the 41% Federal Index

Monitoring:

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

FAST / iReady Diagnostics 3 times a year from Data Review and lesson plans

IEP goals monitored monthly

Inclusion services with monthly scheduling and walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gwen Morris (morrisg@okaloosaschools.com)

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.)

Implement intentional scaffolding strategies within the gradual release framework during both interactive whole group and small group instruction.

I do (teacher modeling), We do (teacher/student collaboration), You do it together (student collaboration with teacher assistance, as needed), You do it alone (student demonstrates skill/concept independently)

Use Strategies for Building Student Success resource to incorporate high yield cognitive engagement strategies within interactive whole group and small group instruction.

Strategically integrate the components of close reading that lead to a culminating task using grade-level complex text(s) to include purposeful text-dependent questions at the appropriate DOK, text-marking, annotating, writing through reading, and purposeful student talk.

Implement Benchmark Advance foundational skills lessons, grounded in the science of reading, with a strong focus on multi-sensory systematic foundational learning that consists of:

Oral Language

Phonological Awareness

Phonics

Fluency

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building these necessary skills will provide the foundation needed to be successful and increase the percentage.

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 3 - Promising 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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The four weakest areas according to our data are: The guidance department at my child's school provides for the educational success of my student (71%), School funds are used to support the school in a financially responsible manner (76%), I receive positive phone calls, emails, or notes about my child from the school (78%), and Parent input is valued at my child's school (78%). Based on these areas, we will strive to better our communication about the guidance department and school funds through the school newsletter and/or Tidbits and by making positive phone calls to parents from both teachers and the front office. We will also provide more opportunities for families to be involved in the decision-making process while providing valuable input.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome we plan to achieve for this upcoming school year in the four weakest areas would be to increase them by at least 10% in each area.

Monitoring:

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

The complete the Parent and Community Awareness Survey

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gwen Morris (morriskg@okaloosaschools.com)

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.)

Classroom newsletters, school newsletters, email, automated informational call outs, class DoJo, Remind App, Friday Tidbits, school website, school Facebook page, communication with Eglin Air Force Base leadership, parent open house/orientation, curriculum nights, School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Organization (PTO).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the Parent and Community Survey, communication is a area which needed more attention. The interventions selected will increase the outcomes desired.

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).

SPP Committee will meet as needed to discuss and review the use of funds in order to ensure they are being used with fidelity.