James E Plew Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

James E Plew Elementary School

220 PINE AVE, Niceville, FL 32578

[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.

Preparing today's students for success within and beyond the classroom.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Plew Elementary shares the OCSD Vision, Preparing today's students for success within and beyond the classroom. Plew Elementary used the district created Shared Values and expanded upon how those values looked specifically at our school:

Passionate – At Plew, teachers are enthusiastic and engaged in student growth and development.

Data Based – At Plew we use common planning and student goal setting; our instruction is driven through the data we acquire.

Accountability – At Plew we hold our students accountable behaviorally through PBIS and academically using "I can…" statements and student-driven goal setting.

Listen – At Plew, actionable steps are taken based on needs identified by our community survey. The use of student discourse in the classroom promotes better student learning and understanding.

Learners – Plew teachers are routinely fostering lifelong learning by encouraging student collaboration, providing engaging lessons, and sharing their passion for student growth.

Coach/Development – At Plew we focus on balanced, purposeful, relevant professional development and readily share our strengths and expertise with colleagues.

Humility – At Pew we use the MTSS process and support is provided for students, families, and teachers to meet academic and behavioral needs. The Plew staff is willing to consider or accept new suggestions and ideas. We aim to support a culture of cooperation.

Relationships – Plew builds relationships through PLA, volunteers, Evening of the Arts, Science Night, Fun Runs, parent patio lunches, Thanksgiving lunch, Open House, Heights, and Kids Kount tutoring, Media Center, Plew gardens, and student clubs.

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
Phillips, Heather	Assistant Principal	Works with the communication piece for the After-school tutoring of our ESE students. Hires staff, coordinates day and time of tutoring and creates permission slips for students to stay after school.
Matz, Tammy	Principal	Oversees current student data to select the ESE students who would most benefit from after school tutoring. Also monitors the curriculum used and makes sure resources are secured.
Sekas, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	After School Tutor for ELA ESE.

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.

March 2023: Presented District SPP focus areas at Faculty Meeting

April 2023: Grade Level meetings teachers reviewed the Components of Interactive Whole Group Instruction; they gave feedback for each component to create a focus for professional development for the 2023-2024 school year

April 2023: SPP Team meeting with District

May 2023: Released Grade Level Chairs to work on a draft SPP for ELA, Math, and Science

June 2023: Using the data collected to include teacher surveys and work that Grade Level Chairs did, SPP writing begins

July 2023: Present to Grade Level Chairs, elicit feedback, make changes, and discuss roll out for preplanning

August 2023: Met with ESE teachers to develop SPP focus for ESSA subgroup data for ESE students

August 2023: Present key slides with progress monitoring at Pre-plan

August 2023: Create SIP plan based on current student data

September 2023: Grade Level Chairs will meet and go in depth of SPP, one page look Fors distributed.

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))

Progress Monitoring

Initiative
POC Tutoring
How Will It Be Monitored
Walk throughs and data from PM and D1-3
Frequency of Official Monitoring
Weekly
Who is Responsible to Monitor
Administration

Initiative
ESE attending GL meetings.
How Will It Be Monitored
Attendance and meeting notes
Frequency of Official Monitoring
Weekly
Who is Responsible to Monitor
Grade Chairs/Admin.

Evaluation Following Progress Monitoring Assessment:
Baseline Data will be evaluated, and refinement of practice will be made.
Mid-Year Data will be evaluated, and refinement will be made.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	22%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	26%
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	5	13	10	15	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	11	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	6	0	6	4	4	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	2	14	10	8	10	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	7	5	13	12	5	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	14	10	8	10	0	0	0	44

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	9	14	15	12	11	0	0	0	61

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	1	0	4	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) 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	11	15	8	7	8	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	11	5	3	2	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	16	9	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	7	13	9	0	0	0	31

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	6	10	14	11	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	6
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	11	15	8	7	8	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	11	5	3	2	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	16	9	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	7	13	9	0	0	0	31

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	6	10	14	11	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	6
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*	76	59	53	79	61	56	80		
ELA Learning Gains				69			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			38		
Math Achievement*	80	65	59	75	47	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				70			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			33		
Science Achievement*	70	57	54	75	63	59	71		
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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	304
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	75			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	78			

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	54			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	62			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	54			

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	76			80			70					
SWD	45			42			25				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	82			62			80				4	
MUL	64			69			46				4	

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	77			83			74				4	
FRL	57			62			43				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	79	69	59	75	70	52	75					
SWD	41	38	31	39	44	42	39					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			50								
HSP	72	67		63	76		33					
MUL	72	61	60	69	65		82					
PAC												
WHT	81	72	62	78	70	49	82					
FRL	59	50	41	56	64	63	48					

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	80	65	38	78	57	33	71					
SWD	45	47		51	42	20	40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			55								
HSP	71			68								
MUL	72	67		68	55		64					
PAC												
WHT	83	66	41	81	59	41	74					
FRL	61	52		57	45		71					

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	76%	61%	15%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	67%	13%	58%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	55%	21%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	65%	17%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	90%	72%	18%	61%	29%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	63%	12%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	57%	13%	51%	19%

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.

SWD 31% made learning gains in ELA for the Lowest 25%.
SWD 38% made learning gains in ELA.
SWD 41% had ELA Achievement.

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

SWD learning gains in ELA dropped from 47% to 38% from previous year. Covid provided no data for learning gains from previous year and is a contributing factor for these student's achievement levels.

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.

District and State data was not available.

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

SWD 20% made learning gains in math 20-21, 42% made learning gains in math 21-22.Math minutes were reviewed for ESE students and adjustments were made.

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

SWD learning gains in ELA and Attendance.

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

1. SWD ELA learning gains
2. Attendance

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.

49 students were absent 10% or more days. 1st and 2nd grade had the highest number of students followed by equal numbers in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.

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

Our goal is to reduce the number of students who are absent 10% or more of total school days to 25.

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

Attendance reports will be pulled from FOCUS quarterly by the Attendance Secretary and given to the Assistant principal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Phillips (phillipsh1@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.)

Using our PBIS plan, we are incorporating incentives for perfect attendance quarterly.

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

Recognition on social media, students receiving "brag tags" for perfect attendance will help motivate parents to get their children to school each day.

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.

Attendance Secretary reviews quarterly attendance and prints report for perfect attendance by grade level. Report is given to AP who will award students with "brag tag" and make social media posts. Attendance awards have been added to the school newsletter to inform parents of this recoginiton.

Person Responsible: Heather Phillips (phillipsh1@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: End of every nine weeks.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

SWD learning gains in ELA dropped from 47% to 38% from previous year.

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

We would like to increase SWD learning gains in ELA to 50%.

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

SWD will be the focus of data chats with teachers and during faculty meetings. Data chats will occur after PM1,2 for FAST and D1 and D2 for iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Matz (tammy.matz@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.)

After school tutoring using 25 minutes of Ready Phonics followed by on grade level Magnetic Readers will occur 2 times a week for 50 minutes for SWD that are identified as having one or more years deficit in learning as identified on FAST and iReady.

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

Phonics instruction is the base to start your reading invention program. Grade level materials provide exposure and high expectations of grade level requirements.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

August: Last year's FAST PM3 data was reviewed and SWD in ELA who scored a level 1 or 2 were identified for After school tutoring using Ready Phonics and Magnetic readers.
September: Tutoring starts for SWD in grades 3,4 and 5
At the end of PM2 and D2, data will be reviewed for progress being made.

Person Responsible: Tammy Matz (tammy.matz@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: Data reviewed after PM1, PM2 and D1 and D2.

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).

Schools are provided a training and timeline from the Curriculum and Instruction Department to complete the School Improvement Plan (SIP). District offers collaborative opportunities for schools to meet:
• Facilitate sharing and presentation of district-level data.
• Support the inclusion of a variety of data sources; assist data collection efforts with district resources and connections.
• Bring schools together to focus on related priorities in order to pool expertise and resources.
Schools then conduct a needs assessment to stakeholders and prioritize needs to be included in SIP. District reviews school SIP and during review process ensures school identifies allowable funding sources that are not currently being utilized to implement the strategy(s) intended to improve learner outcomes; instructional coaches, tutoring, ESE resources, and professional learning. If funding does not match school's identified focus areas, the District will engage school in further conversation with inquiries such as;
• Connect schools with available statewide systems of support, including external facilitators and high quality professional development (FDLRS and FIN).
• Identify the necessary resources that are not currently available to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
• Determine what training is necessary for teachers to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
After District provides feedback to schools, the SIP will be refined and submitted. School district leadership will meet quarterly with schools for collaborative discussion, feedback, and progress monitoring updates on status of SIP focus areas.

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: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$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.

Yes