

Orange County Public Schools

Washington Shores 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Washington Shores Elementary

944 W LAKE MANN DR, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://washingtonshoreses.ocps.net/>

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Jackson Kimble, Myrlene	Principal	Mrs. Myrlene Jackson-Kimble, the Principal, is the school-based instructional leader for academic and behavior instruction. She provides the vision for the school to ensure high academic achievement is attained for all students. Mrs. Jackson-Kimble implements and evaluates programs within our school to ensure that the achievement gap is closing among subgroups. As an administrator, she performs classroom observations to manage and support alignment for student learning. Additionally, actionable feedback is provided to the teachers in order to build capacity, improve instruction as well as ensure academic student success. Mrs. Jackson- Kimble holds weekly Professional Learning Community meetings at each grade with leadership team members to discuss the intensity of standards-based instruction, Tier I and Tier II interventions, and enrichment lessons for students who are working above grade level. She also ensures professional development is based on the needs of the staff to increase student achievement.
Coley, Altamont	Assistant Principal	Mr. Coley, Assistant Principal: Assists the school principal with curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives following the School Improvement Plan. Mr. Coley supports teachers in implementing and monitoring effective whole group and small group instruction. He also observes and conducts staff evaluations and provides support to teachers. Mr. Coley supervises students during the instructional day while implementing and supporting school-wide behavior initiatives. He monitors the progress of the lowest twenty-five percent of students using the MTSS process. Mr. Coley coordinates coaching support for teachers utilizing the leadership team and coordinates professional development for non-instructional staff. He oversees Summer Acceleration Reading Camp and completes all master scheduling. Mr. Coley is also an active participant in SAC.
Hird, Gregory	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mr. Hird supports teachers by providing research-based intervention strategies and instruction programs. He participates in common planning, coordinates curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, and provides school-wide professional development. Mr. Hird facilitates the TOPS program, Teachers Offering Professional Support, to induct new teachers into the school culture. He assists with the implementation of high-yield instructional practices by providing actionable feedback to teachers to promote student learning when using the coaching cycle framework. Mr. Hird oversees the promotion and retention process, and all documentation regarding curriculum programs, and participates in the completion of the School Improvement Plan. He oversees State, District, and School assessments. Mr. Hird facilitates all school curriculum nights to support student, parent, and school-community relationships. Mr. Hird is also an active participant in SAC.
McMillion, Vanessa	Science Coach	Mrs. Vanessa McMillion serves as a behavior and instructional leader. She supports the K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards. She progress monitors grade-level science content, oversees that appropriate science strategies are being implemented in classrooms as well as monitors the assessments to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		ensure that the data reflects improved student learning. Mrs. McMillion also oversees our school-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program to support all students in building positive behavior expectations and habits to achieve high academic achievement.
Castillo, Crystal	Reading Coach	Ms. Crystal Castillo, Reading Coach: Supports K-5 curriculum frameworks addressing the Florida State Standards. She supports school curriculum planning and implementation of curriculum initiatives, provides support to teachers as the ELA instructional coach, and provides feedback to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the individual needs of students. Ms. Castillo assists teachers with the implementation of high-yield instructional practices and monitors the fidelity of Deliberate Practice strategies being used to increase student achievement.
Williams, Shacaree	Staffing Specialist	Mrs. Shacaree Williams provides resources to the staff regarding ESE instruction and monitoring the progress of Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals. She works with the staff to provide our ESE students with supports and services in the classroom. Mrs. Williams also collects and analyzes the data for Tier III interventions and works with the leadership and teachers to provide intervention support.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The principal along with leadership team members initiate the SIP process to refamiliarize themselves with the template and check for changes and updates prior to taking an intense look as to what is being asked. In answering questions for the school improvement process, data is reviewed and shared school-wide and information is disaggregated so that root causes can be identified and actions steps planned. School improvement processes are not only shared with staff but parents as well through School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings which many times occur in tandem with PTO meetings allowing for more parental involvement. Once data and action steps are connected to the planning process during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), progress can then be tracked.

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))

After root causes have been identified and action steps developed to address the needs, monitoring becomes a primary focus. The question is asked, "Is the school improvement process working?" At this point, adjustments are made if an increased proficiency is not showing in the data. Action steps are revised with considerations to the subjects and data along with timelines that acknowledge formative,

unit, and progress monitoring assessments. As information is tracked, adjustments to the allocated resources will occur based upon the needs.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: F 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	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	10	26	20	30	19	15	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	8	3	10	5	4	0	0	0	30
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	14	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	16	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	14	19	27	12	0	0	0	0	73
	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	11	11	20	15	15	0	0	0	73

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	7	27	28	30	26	18	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	4	4	8	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	26	22	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	29	25	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	7	30	25	0	0	0	65

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	7	27	28	30	26	18	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	4	4	8	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	26	22	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	29	25	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	7	30	25	0	0	0	65

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	45	57	53	27	56	56	25		
ELA Learning Gains				37			28		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				22			26		
Math Achievement*	57	60	59	19	46	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				19			17		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32			19		
Science Achievement*	56	63	54	19	61	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	59	59	44			68		

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	255
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	219
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	4	4
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	37	Yes	2	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	53			

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	6	Yes	3	3
ELL	21	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	1	1
HSP	24	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	27	Yes	1	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	45			57			56					53
SWD	18			18							2	
ELL	33			50							3	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47			59			57				5	50
HSP	33			40							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	47			58			54				5	56

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	27	37	22	19	19	32	19					44
SWD	8	6		9	6	0	6					
ELL	22	29		8	12		8					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	36	23	20	21	33	18					33
HSP	33			15								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	24	37	24	16	20	33	19					46

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	25	28	26	30	17	19	33					68
SWD	4	23		12	17							
ELL	6			6								68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	29	28	33	16	20	38					62
HSP	33			8								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	23	29	29	29	20	23	36					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
05	2023 - Spring	49%	54%	-5%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	52%	-12%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	51%	2%

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.

In July 2023, the state released grade level results entitled the "Spring 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking English Language Arts PM3 School Results." Utilizing the state's grade level reports, ELA proficiency is at 47%. This grade level data does not consider whether students are a match for the Full Time Equivalent (FTE) periods and are all inclusive in the denominator for determining percentages. Upon removing student numbers who were not a match to the FTE periods required to count for the school based upon a denominator report generated by the district, Washington Shores is at 49% proficiency for ELA.

Even with the great reduction of the achievement gap from the previous year with a 27% proficiency in 2022, Washington Shores still has contributing factors that will need to be addressed. Foundational skills and comprehension in Reading during Extra Hour along with an emphasis on curtailing absenteeism and tardies by students will be a focus and monitored for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

No data component showed a decline.

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.

According to Grade Level PM3 Results for the “2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking” and the “2023 Statewide Science Assessment,” ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state. The state’s overall percent proficient for ELA in grades 3-5 was at 54%. When comparing Washington Shore’s percent of 47% or the adjusted percent of 49%, the range of the gap is seven to five percentage points of that of the state. Foundational skills and comprehension in Reading along with student tardies and absenteeism are contributing factors.

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

All data components showed double-digit improvement of 20 or more percentage points with Math Achievement leading the way. For the 2021-2022 school year, Washington Shores had a proficiency of 19% in Math. Using the Grade Level PM3 Results for the “2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking,” Washington Shores is at a 56%. When considering students with a match to the FTE periods, the proficiency percentage increases to 58% which is equal to that of the state. An increased emphasis on the common planning framework which included teacher involvement in the data analysis of formative, unit and summative assessments helped propel student achievement. Another priority focus was that of engagement strategies and structures which were used in both whole and small group learning times to increase student involvement and understanding of the content.

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

Reflecting upon EWS data, student absenteeism followed by substantial reading deficiency for 13 of the 2022-2023 third grade students who received good cause exemption are two areas which will be focused upon for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The highest priorities for Washington Shores Elementary during the 2023-2024 school year will include:

- 1) ELA
- 2) Math
- 3) Science
- 4) ESSA Subgroups below 41%: SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL

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 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.

In order to create a positive culture and environment, Washington Shores scholars will participate in community and school-based interactive learning experiences as part of our Green School Initiative. These learning experiences enforce their understanding of Florida standards and benchmarks. The Green School Initiative provides a well-rounded approach to helping others, the community and self through a Heart, Hand, Head and Health philosophy.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring 2024, in the area of social awareness, school climate, and sense of belonging on the Washington Shores Elementary School Climate survey will increase by 5%. Students will actively engage with each other to complete projects that support the school and community environment. Students will learn how to interact with peers in a positive manner in order to achieve positive outcomes.

Monitoring:

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

Data used from the Fall 2023 Washington Shores Elementary School Climate survey will be compared to the results of the Spring 2024 Washington Shores Elementary School Climate survey to monitor social awareness, school climate, and student sense of belonging. Students will be given opportunities to reflect on how relationships with peers and community impacts their academic and social endeavors. As a result of our school-wide initiative, we will see a decrease in absenteeism and negative behaviors in conjunction with the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) system.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) system provides best practices to intervene before targeted behaviors occur. If we intervene before problematic behaviors escalate, the interventions are much more manageable. PBIS uses tiered models of service delivery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS creates positive environmental conditions that enable student to exhibit appropriate behaviors. The school-wide initiative provides a pathway to connect positive behavior with PBIS which is the intended outcome of the Green School initiative.

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?

Yes

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.

School-Based Experiences

Kindergarten & 1st Grade: Vegetable garden to understand the life cycle of plants.

Second Grade: Flower Beds to understand the basic needs of plants.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of October 30th, followed by monthly maintenance.

Community-Based Experiences

Third Grade: School and community clean-up program to take pride in the environment.

Fourth & Fifth Grade: Community garden to build relationships with faith-based partners.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of October 30th, followed by monthly maintenance.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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.

Washington Shores Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic engagement strategies. There is a need to differentiate small group instruction to support Tier II and Tier III MTSS students. ELA proficiency was at 48 percentage points and Math proficiency was at 58 percentage points. A continuum of Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to vigorously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing our staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces proper data collection, progress monitoring, and data analysis, we ensure that students' individual needs are met.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, students tested on the F.A.S.T. assessment will show a 7 percentage point increase in proficiency from 48% to 55 % in ELA.

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, students tested on the F.A.S.T. assessment will show a 12 percentage point increase in proficiency from 58% to 70% in Math.

Monitoring:

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

The school's leadership team will be active participants in all common planning meetings for each content area. Feedback on instructional trends in each content area will be provided during the common planning sessions. The school's leadership team will also attend weekly data meetings, which will focus on analyzing data from common assessments and district progress monitoring assessments to determine trends and needs for changes to instruction. Implementation of any shifts made to lessons will be monitored by the school's leadership by conducting daily classroom walkthroughs. Upon completion of daily walkthroughs, individual feedback will be provided to instructional and support staff via the instructional framework, progress monitoring tools, and the coaching teacher support log.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

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.)

Students are grouped for targeted small group instruction based on running records and assessment screeners for extra hour, reading intervention, and math intervention. Resources for instruction include: Measuring Up (ELA & Math), Phonics for Reading, Number Worlds, and UFLI Foundations. Teachers will be given the opportunity for additional planning time after school to further plan for differentiation of small groups, participate in training and disaggregate data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are progress monitored frequently in order to be placed in appropriate target groupings that are fluid based on student data. These instructional groupings will support students in making learning gains, while closing the achievement gap.

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?

Yes

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.

Design a common planning framework that focuses on disaggregating formative and summative data, standards-based instruction, and engaging instructional delivery.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of August 15th, followed by weekly meetings.

The leadership team will maintain an intense focus on Tier I instruction and also provide resources to enhance Tier II and Tier III instruction to support small groupings as we work to close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of August 15th, followed by bi-weekly meetings.

Teachers will analyze summative and formative data in all academic areas to adjust differentiation to student needs. Data will be continuously collected and analyzed for all students to ensure alignment and effectiveness of instruction for students receiving Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III supports.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of August 15th, followed by bi-weekly meetings.

Teachers will attend professional learning opportunities during PLCs and school-wide staff trainings that focus on MTSS identification, progress monitoring, data collection, and appropriate implementation of tiered resources.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of September 6th, followed by monthly trainings.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Washington Shores Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning standards-based lessons coupled with delivering rigorous instruction to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of B.E.S.T standards. Based on the results from the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. assessment, there is a need for instruction to be more rigorous by building the instructional capacity of the classroom teachers in ELA and Math. 48% of students were proficient in Reading and 58% of students were proficient in Math on the F.A.S.T. assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 55% of the students tested on the F.A.S.T will perform at the proficient level in ELA.

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 70% of the students tested on the F.A.S.T will perform at the proficient level in Math.

Monitoring:

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

The school leadership team will engage in strategic coaching cycles to ensure that the implementation of planned instruction is standards-aligned. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted with the focus of the school's instructional look-fors. After the completion of observations, school leadership will provide feedback to teachers on the benchmark/standard alignment of their lessons. Actionable feedback will be shared during the weekly PLCs to address walkthrough trends. In addition, bite-sized action steps will be shared during coaching sessions for tiered teachers on an Accelerated Coaching Plan. Special emphasis will be placed on closing the achievement gap for students with exceptionalities and English Language Learners (ELL). Equally important, consistent, streamlined, and explicit written and verbal feedback from the administration on instructional practices, school-wide, will be culturally embedded to enhance pedagogical practices. Student common assessments and F.A.S.T. data will also be used to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

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.)

Students are grouped for small group instruction based on common assessments, Exact Path and SuccessMaker data for teacher-led small group instruction. Resources for instruction include: Heggerty Primary Extension, Magnetic Reading and Ready Florida B.E.S.T Mathematics. Teachers will be given the opportunity for additional planning time after school to further plan for B.E.S.T benchmark aligned questioning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are progress monitored frequently in order to be placed in appropriate groupings that are fluid based on student data. The appropriate instructional groupings will move students to the needed learning gains and lead to mastery of the B.E.S.T 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?

Yes

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.

Build teacher capacity in delivering instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmarks through the use of a strategic coaching process which includes an identified focus and coaching method. Teachers will receive tiered support by the school leadership team and will engage in an accelerated coaching plan to increase teacher capacity. These coaching cycles will be monitored using the Teacher Support Log for Coaching.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of August 22nd, followed by weekly meetings.

Grade-level teams will participate in weekly common planning, facilitated by school-based leadership teams to deepen teachers' understanding of the B.E.S.T. standards. During common planning, the facilitator will emphasize the prerequisite skills that are needed; questioning strategies, monitoring techniques, and engagement strategies. The school-based leadership team will continue meeting with teachers and support staff weekly to discuss student progress and needs in all content areas. This also includes planning strategies to support our English Language Learners (ELL). ESE support staff will collaborate with teachers and instructional coaches in PLCs to provide high-yield strategies for students with learning disabilities.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of August 15th, followed by weekly meetings.

The school-based leadership team and School Transformation Office (STO) support will provide professional learning aligned to B.E.S.T. standards, authentic student engagement, monitoring for student understanding, and high-yield strategies. These opportunities will also be based on results of instructional trend data, assessment results, and lesson progression review. These main areas of professional learning will strengthen instructional trends and student progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

By When: Initial Date of September 20th, followed by monthly meetings.

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).

Washington Shores Elementary continually reviews the use of resources that are connected to general funds and funds which are dedicated to school improvement activities. Any deficiency of resources which is usually a lack of time and/or people may assist in fostering low performance. To combat this scenario, Washington Shores Elementary plans to scaffold planning and learning processes through offering after school sessions for teachers to become better acquainted with content and design the instructional strategies in order to better

convey the information and engage students. After school tutoring will also be key in supporting student learning for those who may need additional time involved in the content.

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

In grades K-2, 22% of students were on track to score a Level 3 or above according to the STAR EOY results.

1. In Kindergarten, 39% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.
2. In First grade, 18% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.
3. In Second grade, 10% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.

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

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

The proficiency levels in grades 3-5 were as follows according to the "RAISE Schools Identification 2023-2024" document:

1. In 3rd grade, 41% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
2. In 4th grade, 53% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.
3. In 5th grade, 51% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 60% of students in grades K-2 will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

- 1) By the end of the year, at least 60% of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
- 2) By the end of the year, at least 60% of students in first grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
- 3) By the end of the year, at least 60% of students in second grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 55% of tested students in grades 3-5 will achieve a proficient score on the state assessment which is an increase of 7 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

- 1) By the end of the year, 55% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of 14 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.
- 2) By the end of the year, 55% of students in fourth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of two percentage points when compared to the previous school year.
- 3) By the end of the year, 55% of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of four percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

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.

In effort to support RAISE, Washington Shores Elementary will use beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments through F.A.S.T. as well as the Exact Path instructional tool. Monitoring will also be accomplished using district common assessment data from the Standards-based Unit

Assessments and data gained from documented MTSS interventions provided to students at the Tier II and Tier III levels through such programs as UFLI Foundations and Heggerty. Monthly data meetings will occur with grade level teachers to review students' data and address adjustments that may need to be made in order to monitor response to intervention. Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators will occur to observe the teaching and learning processes including foundational skills and reading interventions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jackson Kimble, Myrlene, myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net

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?

The school is a part of the School Transformation Office, and will use evidence-based programs such as Exact Path and UFLI Foundations for instruction and monitoring. The school will align with the District's expectation of recommended curriculum, targeted professional development, and differentiated instruction for students who are identified as needing Tier II and Tier III support. The school will use the District approved streamlined walkthrough tool weekly to monitor instruction and identify trends.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The following components of the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Practice Guide identifies strategies when used in tandem with appropriate educational programs like that of Heggerty, UFLI Foundations and Exact Path meet a strong level of evidence to support ESSA subgroups:

-Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)

-UFLI Foundations (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

-Exact Path (Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>1. MTSS process will be constantly monitored as students are properly placed in fluid Tiers based on their needs.</p> <p>- Literacy Leadership - The Leadership Team will monitor Functional Basic Skills (FBS) and small group instruction by utilizing classroom walkthroughs.</p> <p>- Literacy Coaching - Lessons for small group instruction will be addressed during the PLC process.</p> <p>- Assessment - Assessment information gathered from FBS and small group instruction will be utilized to make adjustments to the student groups.</p> <p>- Professional Learning - Training in the programs for UFLI Foundations and Heggerty will be available to new employees.</p>	<p>Jackson Kimble, Myrlene, myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net</p>
<p>Teachers will attend PLCs three times per week to go over details of upcoming lessons, plan text-based and benchmark-based questions, and plan for student responses.</p> <p>- Literacy Leadership - Leadership Team members will attend and support PLCs as well as follow up with classroom walkthroughs along with data disaggregation so informed decisions about instruction can be made.</p> <p>- Literacy Coaching - The Literacy Coach will provide side-by-side coaching and modeling of lessons to aid with the understanding or delivery of content.</p> <p>- Assessment - Standards-based Unit Assessments will be utilized to determine students' understanding of content and make adjustments to future lessons. F.A.S.T. data is being used to initialize the student groups and upcoming diagnostic data will be used to update the student groups.</p> <p>- Professional Learning - Training in UFLI Foundations, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. standards will be available.</p>	<p>Jackson Kimble, Myrlene, myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Information about our school SIP, UniSIG, and SWP will be shared with our stakeholders during our monthly SAC meetings and quarterly CAT meetings. The School Improvement Plan is also available on our school webpage.

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))

In order to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders, teachers will hold parent conference nights each quarter. In addition, teachers will use school planners and Talking Points for daily communication with parents.

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)

Washington Shores elementary has an extra hour of instruction dedicated to instruction in reading to help close the achievement gap. Tutoring is also offered during the week to accelerate student acquisition of skills in reading and math. Teachers plan for instruction each week using district and supplemental resources that align with the B.E.S.T standards.

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))

N/A

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))

Washington Shores Elementary has a guidance counselor, social worker, and outside state funded counseling services to improve students' skills outside academic subject areas.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Washington Shores staff recommend students to the MTSS process, to support students with behavioral and academic concerns. The school-wide behavior plan is Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS).

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))

The school-based leadership team and district support will provide professional learning aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks, authentic student engagement, monitoring for student understanding, and high-yield strategies. These opportunities will also be based on results of instructional trend data, assessment results, and lesson progression review. These main areas of professional learning will strengthen instructional trends and student progress monitoring data.

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))

During the summer months, Washington Shores Elementary offers a Jumpstart to Kindergarten program to help students make the transition from Pre-School.

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: Other				\$22,895.76
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6150	130	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG	0.37	\$16,380.00
			<i>Notes: Curriculum nights - 26 teachers @ \$30/hr. X 3 hrs X 7 nights = 16,380.00 (Sept., Oct., Nov., Jan., Feb., Mar., Apr.). Teachers will have one hour of prep/set-up and two hours of parent/student lessons.</i>			
	6150	210	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$2,222.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement Benefits for Curriculum nights - 26 teachers</i>			
	6150	220	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$1,253.07

			<i>Notes: Social Security for Curriculum nights - 26 teachers</i>			
	6150	240	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$427.68
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for Curriculum nights - 26 teachers</i>			
	6150	510	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$2,613.01
			<i>Notes: Supplies/resources to support curriculum nights: Parent Make and Takes, flyers, posters, notebooks, office supplies - \$2, 613.01</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$123,194.24
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	160	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG	0.5	\$21,758.58
			<i>Notes: Salary for 1 - .5 Program Assistant @ \$21, 758.58 to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	210	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$2,952.63
			<i>Notes: Retirement Benefits for 1 - .5 Program Assistant to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	220	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$1,664.53
			<i>Notes: Social Security Benefits for 1 - .5 Program Assistant to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	231	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$4,644.50
			<i>Notes: Health Benefits for 1 - .5 Program Assistant to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	232	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$15.36
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance Benefits for 1 - .5 Program Assistant to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	240	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$568.11
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for 1 - .5 Program Assistant to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	250	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$9.13
			<i>Notes: Unemployment Compensation for 1 - .5 Program Assistant to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	290	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$582.04
			<i>Notes: Additional Employee Benefits for 1 - .5 Program Assistant to support small group instruction</i>			
	5100	500	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$26,773.16
			<i>Notes: Number Worlds Math Curriculum - not to exceed \$26,773.16 to support low performing students in Math.</i>			

	5100	360	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$3,283.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase Renaissance(Accelerated reader) software program to support reading practice K-5- not to exceed \$3,283.00</i>			
	5100	360	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$993.25
			<i>Notes: Purchase Renaissance(Accelerated STAR) software program to support reading practice K-5 not to exceed \$993.25</i>			
	5100	519	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$2,572.76
			<i>Notes: 10% Allowable technology- printers to support FAST writing practice in ELA = \$2,572.76</i>			
	5100	510	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$7,481.25
			<i>Notes: Allowable Classroom supplies not to exceed \$7,481.25 to include composition books, pens, pencils, crayons, paper, markers and post-it notes</i>			
	6300	390	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$27,200.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes @\$170/day for monthly planning days for 20 teachers (8 days). 20 Teachers X 8 days X 170 per day =27,200.00</i>			
	5100	500	5861 - Washington Shores Elementary	UniSIG		\$22,695.94
			<i>Notes: Curriculum enhancements to support literacy and math: Lake Shore Learning - not to exceed \$22,695.94</i>			
					Total:	\$146,090.00

Budget Approval

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

No