Felix A Williams Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Felix A Williams Elementary School

401 NW BAKER RD, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/fawes

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/19/2023.

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.

The mission of Felix A. Williams Elementary School is Every Student, Every Day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Felix A. Williams Elementary School is Empowerment Through 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
Tuthill, Sarah	Principal	Evaluate data with the leadership team and create a plan using research-based strategies. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.
Browning, Justin	Assistant Principal	Evaluate data with the leadership team and create a plan using research-based strategies. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.
Garrett, Emily	Other	Facilitate MTSS Process with leadership team, evaluate data, place students in appropriate interventions, and monitor student progress.

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.

Data will be discussed with leadership team, and School Advisory Council. School Advisory council includes parents, staff, and community members.

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))

Through monthly leadership meetings, we will collaboratively review current student data along with progress. We will have conversations around instructional strategies that prove to yield student

engagement and results. We will work closely with our MTSS program to restructure groups to facilitate students making learning gains.

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	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	42%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	74	82	81	103	94	88	0	0	0	522
One or more suspensions	4	2	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	15	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	14	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	7	9	27	13	12	0	0	0	72
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	3	3	6	5	0	0	0	23

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	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	34	21	30	22	17	32	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	1	0	4	2	4	5	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	15	20	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	12	36	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	9	11	5	12	0	0	0	46

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	2	5	13	24	0	0	0	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	14
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	34	21	30	22	17	32	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	1	0	4	2	4	5	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	15	20	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	12	36	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	9	11	5	12	0	0	0	46

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	2	5	13	24	0	0	0	44

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	14
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*	66	55	53	62	53	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				53			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			45		
Math Achievement*	73	62	59	59	43	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				52			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				20			35		
Science Achievement*	62	55	54	49	54	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		53	59	46			64		

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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	264
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	41			
ELL	72			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	2	
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	55			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	25	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	1	1
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	66			73			62					
SWD	43			55							3	
ELL	67			75							3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			44							3	
HSP	67			71							3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			76			64				4	
FRL	55			65			47				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	62	53	36	59	52	20	49					46
SWD	43	41	43	41	42	23	19					
ELL	30			0								46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			27								
HSP	41	44	40	47	33	10	24					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	57	37	61	56	25	54					
FRL	50	47	35	47	48	23	30					

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	66	60	45	62	49	35	53					64
SWD	36	50	50	37	35	36	28					
ELL	33			33								64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			23								
HSP	57	60		53			58					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	63	53	65	53	39	54					
FRL	46	46	47	45	35	36	31					

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	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	66%	12%	58%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	51%	11%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	62%	14%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	71%	14%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	56%	10%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	50%	10%	51%	9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The third grade ELA scores showed the lowest performance for the 2022-23 school year at 63% proficiency. The 2 low performing subgroups are SWD at 40% proficiency, and Blk students at 38% proficiency.
There are multiple possible contributing factors. Transitioning to a new assessment system (FAST), still transitioning to a new ELA Curriculum are possible factors. This cohort of students also spent the majority of kindergarten online due to Covid.

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

The 5th grade math scores showed the greatest need for improvement. 5th grade students scored 49% proficiency on math PM3 in Spring 2023. Possible factors for this are staff turnover during the school year, and transitioning to a new math curriculum.

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.

State averages have not been populated into the previous section as of yet.

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 was 4th grade math. 4th grade increased from 71% to 79% proficiency. The 4th grade team was very well versed in data analysis, and had a strong PLC team. They identified learning gaps early, and implemented targeted interventions.

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

An area of concern is behavior and suspensions. We had 72 students with an attendance rate below 90%. We had 18 students with one or more suspensions.

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

1) Strong PLC teams analyzing data 2) Targeted intervention 3) Targeting needs in small group instruction. 4)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.

In the 22-23 school year we had 18 students receive out of school suspension. When students are suspended, they miss valuable learning time.
Positive Culture and Environment. We have a strong PBIS program to recognize positive behavior.

We recognize staff with monthly staff member of the month award, and monthly staff meal, and regular staff socials.

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

By the end of 23-24 school we will reduce out of school suspensions to less than 10 students. We will receive a strong or very strong rating under Supportive Environment in our 5 Essentials Survey from students and staff.

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

We will monitor student behavior at our monthly PBIS meetings and during MTSS. We will check in with monitoring student behavior. We will check in with teachers regularly during leadership meetings to gather feedback, suggestions, etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Tuthill (tuthils@martinschools.org)

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.)

In order to reduce the number of Out of School Suspensions, we will be using Positive Behavior Intervention & Support (PBIS) strategies.

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

PBIS is a researched based program for promoting and rewarding positive school behaviors.

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.

-Golden Spatula - recognizes positive cafeteria behavior

Person Responsible: Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

-Splash Bucks - recognize positive behavior schoolwide

Person Responsible: Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Bus Bucks- reward positive behavior on bus

Person Responsible: Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

We recognize staff with monthly staff member of the month award, and monthly staff meal, and regular staff socials.

Person Responsible: Sarah Tuthill (tuthils@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Students with disabilities.
Rationale: Students with disabilities showed a significant gap between non SWD's. For ELA, SWD's scored 60% proficiency compared to 68% overall. In math, SWD's scored 49 % proficient compared to 76% proficient.

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

Our goal is for each class to increase proficiency for SWD's in both ELA and Math by 5%.

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

Lesson plans and classroom observations of our self contained VE classes as well as our Support Facilitated general education classes. We will be monitoring this subgroup at our monthly MTSS meetings and during our grade level data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

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.)

Increasing foundational reading skills including phonemic and phonological awareness through research based multi-sensory curriculum:
Sound Sensible
SPIRE
Fundations
Benchmark Advance

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

By increasing phonemic and phonological awareness, we will strengthen foundational skills so that students will be able to decode and comprehend grade level text.

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.

Provide training for ESE teachers and ESE paraprofessionals and follow up with differentiated support. Monitor lesson, and conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity and implementation of support.

Person Responsible: Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

By When: Monitor once per month

We have adjusted our master schedule to allow increased time for Support Facilitation to support student with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Sarah Tuthill (tuthils@martinschools.org)

By When: September 1st, 2023

Provide ongoing professional development in foundational reading strategies.

Person Responsible: Sarah Tuthill (tuthils@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 following subgroups - ELL HSP, FRL, and BLK scored significantly below other subgroups in both reading and math.

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

By PM3 of 23-24, ELL HSP, FRL, and BLK subgroups will score at or above the 41% on the Federal Index.

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

Students who are not proficient will be monitored and placed in Intervention groups to supplement instruction. Subgroups will be monitored during monthly MTSS Meetings, monthly data chats, and after each Progress Monitoring (FAST) Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Garrett (garrete@martinschools.org)

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.)

We will use targeted small group intervention that includes differentiation and scaffolding.

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

Differentiation and scaffolding are strategies that allow all students access to on grade level standards.

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.

We will follow our MTSS process to identify students needing intervention.

Person Responsible: Emily Garrett (garrete@martinschools.org)

By When: September 2023

ELL Paraprofessional will assist by pushing in during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

During collaborative planning, teachers will intentionally plan scaffolding strategies and differentiated assignments.

Person Responsible: Sarah Tuthill (tuthils@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

We will be closely monitoring the subgroups that are receiving intervention and will make data based adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible: Emily Garrett (garrete@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

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).

Based upon the data from the 2022-23 school year, resources and allocations have been shifted to include full time reading and math coaches. By adding these allocations we are able to provide consistent instructional support for all teachers based on their individual needs. Coaches will also participate in teacher data chats to help create specific plans for low performing students. Close monitoring of our ESSA subgroups will be included in these data chats. In addition, a full time interventionist will be providing targeted interventions specifically to struggling 2nd - 4th graders. These allocation changes directly support our need for improvement in ELA and Math proficiency.