

Broward County Public Schools

Franklin Academy F School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

Franklin Academy F

5000 SW 207TH TERRACE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33332

franklin-academy.org

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.

Utilizing an intercultural-mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasizes character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Utilizing an intercultural mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasize character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

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
Showalter, Diane	Principal	The instructional leader responsible with ensuring that all students receive an effective standards-based instruction.

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.

All stakeholders were involved in adding input to the development of the SIP. A meeting was held to go over why Franklin was identified for a SIP. The data was looked over and in a roundtable discussion a needs assessment was conducted. The focus of the conversation was identifying the why SWD were performing below performance level, identified the potential causes, and possible actionable goals to accomplish by the end of the school year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

After each state assessment progress monitoring period, the collection and analyzation of the student data is done to monitor for progress. Interim assessment tools are used for progress monitoring prior to state assessment benchmarks. These progress monitoring checks are essential to ensure that the action steps detailed in the SIP are working effectively towards student achievement gains. Based on the results of these ongoing checks, the team will decide if necessary changes must be made prior to state assessment benchmarks. A key element to achieve success involves conducting data chats and curriculum meetings where our general education teachers and ESE facilitators collaborate to discuss student-specific data. These meetings result in the creation of tailored action plans that best address the individual needs of each student. Formal data chats will persist after each progress monitoring assessment, facilitating an ongoing, detailed review of student progress. Additionally, informal data chats will be conducted during department meetings to ensure continuous monitoring of student advancement. By taking these comprehensive measures, we aim to significantly improve the academic status of our SWD subgroup and ensure that all students achieve their full potential. The goal is to ensure that positive progress is evident.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	91%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	Yes
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	22	26	16	20	17	22	50	56	78	307
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	22	44	46	64	73	284
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	65	78	77	49	44	53	366
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	12	21	25	43	49	57	207

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

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

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	4	3	4	3	0	0	1	2	18
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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	10	11	10	6	14	15	25	40	45	176	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	34	33	96	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4	18	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	24	34	43	111	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	5	4	4	4	1	47	96	81	243	

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	1	2	3	0	8	40	57	60	171	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	3	0	8	40	57	60	171	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	

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*	52	55	53	54	57	55	52		
ELA Learning Gains				55			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			59		
Math Achievement*	44	52	55	46	47	42	35		
Math Learning Gains				61			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			28		
Science Achievement*	43	50	52	52	52	54	37		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	68	68	62	64	59	51		
Middle School Acceleration	59	72	70	67	57	51	47		
Graduation Rate		68	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	60	53	55	49	75	70	47		

** 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	35	Yes	4	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	59			
BLK	52			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	46			

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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	49			
HSP	55			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	50			

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	52			44			43	64	59			60
SWD	23			20			35	36			5	60
ELL	44			42			29	55	38		7	60
AMI												
ASN	62			55							2	
BLK	50			38			27	68	60		6	
HSP	51			45			46	60	55		7	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60			50			47	77	73		6	
FRL	45			38			35	54	38		7	60

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	54	55	41	46	61	55	52	62	67			49
SWD	21	37	29	20	48	40	23	27				
ELL	47	52	41	39	52	52	37	50	71			49
AMI												
ASN	74	79		61	65							
BLK	47	47	40	38	57	50	52	55	56			
HSP	56	56	44	49	62	58	51	62	67			48
MUL	50	58		44	73							
PAC												
WHT	54	49	30	44	63	64	62	69				
FRL	50	50	35	42	59	55	47	58	58			48

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	52	53	59	35	23	28	37	51	47			47
SWD	16	38	42	16	31	38	10	23				
ELL	43	57	57	31	27	31	29	44	60			47
AMI												
ASN	85	80		68	33		80		85			
BLK	48	34	31	25	22	32	21	49	24			
HSP	52	57	62	34	23	28	35	52	45			47
MUL	33			45								
PAC												
WHT	51	42		40	14		50	29	65			
FRL	45	50	56	27	20	25	28	44	44			41

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	45%	56%	-11%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	47%	49%	-2%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	49%	-4%	47%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	58%	-9%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	47%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	53%	12%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	54%	-17%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	51%	-7%	48%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	65%	-34%	61%	-30%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	46%	10%	55%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	27%	58%	-31%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	38%	-2%	44%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	23%	46%	-23%	51%	-28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	48%	48%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	46%	34%	48%	32%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	63%	35%	63%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	64%	0%	66%	-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.

Franklin Academy Campus F demonstrated the lowest performance on overall ELA student achievement in the SWD subgroup with 21%, compared to our General-Ed population who scored a 54%.

A contributing factor to students' performance was the initial first full year of students returning back on campus from virtual learning post pandemic, students coming in below grade level, and lack of data driven instruction to support student achievement and growth. Another contributing factor was students were on a 7 period schedule, students had a restrained time to get acquainted in class and focus.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was our SWD subgroup that decreased from a 42% to 29%. Contributing factors related to this decline and 90% of our students were virtual and participated in an instructional model during COVID and did not participate in State Assessments. Additional contributing factors were new teachers to the profession with limited knowledge on implementing accommodations through the tier 1 instruction.

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.

Greatest gap compared to the state was ELA Lowest 25% with a 41% compared to the state at 46%.

The contributing factors were an influx of new teachers to the profession with limited knowledge on implementing tier 1 instruction.

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 the ELA Achievement level from 16% to 21%. A Contributing factor was Franklin Academy students were on campus for instruction, allowing

teachers and support facilitators to provide appropriate services to students and accommodations in person. ESE team members were able to make changes to IEPs from temporary distance learning plans to original plans to adding services and accommodations.

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

After reviewing the EWS data, a potential area of concern in proficiency levels in Math.

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

1. Supporting our students with disabilities
2. Tier 1 Differentiated instruction
3. Implement MTSS Process with fidelity.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Students with disabilities continue to perform below 41% index level for 3 consecutive years.

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 PM3, 50% of students with disabilities within ELA achievement will make one achievement level gain on the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The ESE team will participate in bi-weekly curriculum meetings with grade level and department team meetings. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined and monitored for progress. The ESE team will have their own department meeting to check in on individual student progress. The ESE team will participate in ongoing data chats with grade level and departments to ensure students at risk are being supported.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.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.)

Students with disabilities will have the opportunity to receive remediation through Progress Learning Software- an instructional software aligned to standard based lessons, assessments and practice skills. Students will be provided with small group instruction to close the achievement gap within tier 1 instruction with our HMH ELA resources. Ongoing data chats will be implemented based on progress monitoring data checks. ESE students will be provided with a Learning Strategies class added to their schedule. Learning Strategies class consists of students will be working on independent functioning skills that will support core classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help provide remediation in a small group setting to assist with tier 1 instruction and be able to meet the needs of our students with disabilities. Data chats are an integral part of monitoring for student growth and ensuring that the support provided is effective. Placing our ESE Students in a learning strategy class will increase the effectiveness of their independent functioning skills to support academic growth.

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.

1. Remediation through Progress Learning
2. Differentiated Small Group Instructions
3. Data Chats
4. Implementation of Learning Strategies class in current schedule

Person Responsible: Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.org)

By When: Beginning of November 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Overall achievement level and learning gains to ensure we earn a grade level A on the school report card.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of PM3, the scores of the FAST assessments will amount to a 3-5 point increase in school grade level to achieve a rating of A.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will participate in bi-weekly curriculum meetings with grade level and department team meetings. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined and monitored for progress. Administration and Accountability team will conduct lesson plan checks to ensure standards-based instruction is taking place as well as ensuring IEP goals and learning outcomes match student IEPs. Gradebook checks will be conducted to ensure assessments and gradebook data aligns to depth and rigor for the standards. Instructional coaching meetings will be held to ensure teachers are being supported.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.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.)

All teachers will plan differentiated small group instruction using research-based evidence based instructional resources. Students who are performing below grade level will be placed through the RTI program and be provided interventions that align to their skill deficit. Teachers will evaluate the effectiveness of their tier 1 formative assessments. Support will be provided

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help teachers plan for effective small group differentiated instruction through their collaborative/curriculum planning meetings with the support of their admin and curriculum specialist to ensure the plan aligns with student data. Implementing the RTI process will help provide students who are in need of interventions to receive remediation in their area of need. Reviewing formative assessments will guarantee that assessments align to the depth and rigor of the BEST standards. Instructional coaching will be provided to teachers who are in need of support to increase the effectiveness of their classroom instruction and impact student achievement.

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.

1. Differentiated Small Group instruction
2. Begin RTI process and provide students with interventions
3. Evaluate formative assessments
4. Implement coaching cycles

Person Responsible: Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.org)

By When: Beginning of November 2023

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

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

The School demonstrated the lowest performance in ELA Achievement within our students with disabilities, with a 23%. General ed population scored a 56% in ELA Achievement. In order for continuous improvement we must provide ongoing support for all students and teachers to increase student achievement. All stakeholders play a part in supporting our students' growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of PM3, SWD subgroup will achieve the target 41% or higher per the Federal Percent Points Index for performance on the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The School will monitor student classroom and benchmark data in bi-weekly curriculum meetings as well as state assessment data to ensure that plans are being implemented and monitored for success. The ESE team will be part of the curriculum meetings to assess ESE student progress. The guidance department will have ongoing meetings to ensure students are being assisted in their academic plans for graduation requirements and future endeavors. Parents meetings are held to ensure they are involved in their students' academic plans to provide that additional support at home.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Showalter (showalter.diane@franklin-academy.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.)

Professional development will be provided to all teachers to improve capacity in providing accommodation in the classroom and student support. Additional teacher development will be provided and ongoing to improve instructional delivery practices, student engagement, designing assessments, and evaluating results.

Teachers will continue to implement differentiated instruction in the classroom to support all students. Teachers use their classroom data and place students in groups based on student performance data. Teachers are encouraged to implement station rotation model, so all students have the opportunity to receive differentiated support and be able to master their area of need.

All students have an advisory period where important topics for students well-being and developmental are discussed in a collaborative way.

All students are exposed to many post-high school education and career options through on-campus visits, field trips, and other learning opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All stakeholders, teachers, staff, students and families, play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school. Teachers and staff will be supportive of the student in following their roles of maintaining a safe and positive learning environment. Family roles include participating in schoolwide events, and communication with teachers and staff. The intervention plan was written to ensure students receive suitable support in school to ensure academic growth and achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Franklin Academy funding allocations will be generated through Title 1 Funds. Having been identified as ATSI School we will fulfill our interventions using funding through these means. Allocating for additional instructional support as interventionists and support staff to assist with small group instruction and RTI/iii time allocated in teachers schedules. Additional resources and curriculum has also been purchased to support our areas of focus.

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

For Grades K-2, the school's Area of Focus in Reading/ELA aims to provide enhanced instruction and support for literacy, even though no grade had 50% of students scoring below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. The focus is on building strong foundations in literacy to ensure students are well-prepared for future grades. Here is the description, impact, and rationale/Area

of Focus: Early Literacy Foundations

- Early literacy foundations for Kindergarten through Grade 2 lay the groundwork for students' future reading and writing skills.
- Strengthening early literacy skills is essential to ensure that students develop strong reading and comprehension abilities.

Rationale: While no grade exhibited a high percentage of students scoring below Level 3 on the 2023 ELA assessment, the school recognizes the importance of early literacy development in these foundational years. Therefore, the focus on early literacy instruction is based on the principle of proactive education. By fostering strong reading and writing foundations, the school aims to prevent potential literacy challenges in the upper grades and equip students with the skills needed for long-term success in ELA.

Formative assessments and diagnostic assessments have been reviewed to assess students' progress and identify areas of need.

- Coordinated screening and progress monitoring data for the 2022-2023 academic year have been examined to ensure that students are on track for scoring Level 3 or above on statewide, standardized ELA assessments.

In conclusion, despite not meeting the 50% threshold for students scoring below Level 3 on the 2023 ELA assessment, the school recognizes the importance of early literacy foundations. The focus on these foundational skills is based on a proactive approach to ensure that all students have a solid literacy base to excel in Reading/ELA as they progress through their academic journey.

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

Area of Focus: Comprehension Strategies

- Proficiency in comprehension strategies is essential for Grade 3 students to understand and engage with more complex texts.
- Inadequate comprehension skills can hinder students' ability to extract meaning from texts, impacting their overall literacy development.

Rationale:

- In Grade 3, 35% of students scored below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment, indicating a substantial need for improvement. This assessment is a critical reference point for identifying areas of deficiency. The data underscores the requirement for explicit instruction in comprehension strategies to boost student performance in ELA.

Grade 4:

Area of Focus: Vocabulary Development and Reading Fluency

- Enhancing vocabulary and reading fluency is crucial for Grade 4 students to comprehend and engage with more advanced texts.
- Weak vocabulary and fluency can be a barrier to understanding and expressing ideas effectively in writing.

Rationale:

- In Grade 4, 51% of students scored below Level 3 on the 2023 ELA assessment, highlighting a significant area of concern. Furthermore, the observed 11% growth from PM2 to PM3 indicates that ongoing monitoring and instruction in vocabulary development and fluency are necessary to bring struggling students up to proficiency.

Grade 5:

Area of Focus: Critical Analysis and Writing Skills

- Developing critical analysis and writing skills is essential for Grade 5 students to analyze and synthesize information effectively.
- Insufficient skills in critical analysis and writing can hinder students' ability to engage deeply with texts and convey their thoughts.

Rationale:

- In Grade 5, 54% of students scored below Level 3 on the 2023 ELA assessment. A notable 14% growth from PM1 to PM3 in progress monitoring data indicates the potential for improvement with targeted instruction. Strengthening critical analysis and writing skills is vital to address this need.

Data sources:

- The percentage of students scoring below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment served as a key indicator of areas that required intervention.
- Progress monitoring data, particularly the growth from PM1 to PM3 in Grades 4 and 5, highlighted the potential for improvement through targeted instruction.
- Formative and diagnostic assessments were used to identify specific weaknesses and monitor students' progress.

In summary, the school's focus areas for Grades 3-5 in Reading/ELA are rooted in comprehensive data analysis. The percentages of students below Level 3 on the ELA assessment and growth in progress monitoring data indicate the critical need for targeted instruction in comprehension strategies, vocabulary development, reading fluency, critical analysis, and writing skills to enhance student learning and literacy proficiency.

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

Kindergarten (K):

- Prior year data: In the Fall, 56% of Kindergarteners were proficient, and 46% were not.
- Measurable outcome: The goal is to reach 65% proficiency by PM3.

1st Grade (1):

- Prior year data: As Kindergarteners, current 1st graders were 77% proficient and 23% not. At PM1, they were 61% proficient and 39% were not.
- Measurable outcome: The goal is to achieve 65% proficiency by PM3.

2nd Grade (2):

- Prior year data: Current 2nd graders were 75% proficient in their PM3, with 25% not proficient. At PM1, they were 47% proficient and 53% were not.
- Measurable outcome: The goal is to reach 55% proficiency by PM3, considering factors like the summer slide and new standards in PM1.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd Grade (3):

- Prior year data: In PM3, 3rd graders were at 48% proficiency with 52% not proficient. At PM1, they were at 20% proficiency and 80% not proficient.
- Measurable outcome: The goal is for PM2 to show 30% proficiency and PM3 to have 51% proficiency.

4th Grade (4):

- Prior year data: In PM3, 35 students were at Level 3. In PM1 of Fall 2023 FAST, 24 students scored at Level 2.
- Measurable outcome: Although students didn't show learning loss, there was a level drop due to the scale score increase. The desired outcome is to maintain or improve the level within the scale score range.

5th Grade (5):

- Prior year data: In PM3, 5th graders were at 44% proficiency and 56% not proficient. In PM1 this fall, they were at 8% proficiency and 91% not proficient.
- Measurable outcome: The goal is for PM2 to show 50% proficiency and PM3 to have at least 51% proficiency.

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.

The school's area of focus, which primarily centers around improving literacy outcomes, will be closely monitored to ensure that desired outcomes are achieved. Ongoing monitoring is critical for assessing progress and making necessary adjustments to enhance student achievement outcomes. It ensures that strategies are effective, that students receive the support they need, and that the school maintains a data-driven, responsive approach to literacy improvement.

1. Regular Assessments: The school will continue to conduct regular assessments, such as progress monitoring assessments and standardized ELA assessments, at specific intervals during the school year.
2. Data Analysis: Assessment data, including the results from PM1/PM2/PM3 and subsequent assessments, will be collected and analyzed systematically. The data analysis will identify trends, areas of improvement, and students who may need additional support.
3. Progress Monitoring: The school will continue the robust progress monitoring system, which includes tracking students' growth over time, data chats with students, as well as data chats among teachers and administrators.
4. Individual Student Data: Student data is closely monitored on an individual basis. Teachers and administrators pay attention to how each student is progressing, allowing for personalized support and intervention when necessary.
5. Timely Interventions: When students are identified as not meeting the desired outcomes or falling behind, timely interventions are initiated. These include additional tutoring, targeted support, and/or modifications to instructional approaches.
6. Adjustments to Instruction: The ongoing monitoring process provides insights into the effectiveness of specific instructional methods. If a particular approach is not yielding the expected results, educators

make adjustments to teaching strategies. The leadership and support team, as well as administrators, support this endeavor to ensure student achievement.

7. Professional Learning: Teachers, leadership, support, and administration teams all engage in ongoing professional development to stay informed about evidence-based practices and the latest instructional methods. Their learning is aligned with the data and needs of the students.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Paz, Frances, paz.frances@franklin-academy.org

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?

Kindergarten (K) - Evidence-Based Program:

- Program: Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring
- Alignment with Florida Definition: Yes, this program is considered evidence-based as it aligns with the criteria of having strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence.
- Alignment with District's Reading Plan: Yes, this program aligns with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan as it includes screening and progress monitoring, which are essential components of reading assessment.
- Alignment with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards: Yes, this program aligns with the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards by focusing on students' reading skills.

1st Grade (1) - Evidence-Based Program:

- Program: Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring
- Alignment with Florida Definition: Yes, this program aligns with Florida's definition as it involves screening and monitoring student progress, which are proven practices.
- Alignment with District's Reading Plan: This program aligns with the district's reading plan by incorporating screening and progress monitoring, key elements of reading assessment.
- Alignment with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards: It aligns with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards by targeting students' reading proficiency.

2nd Grade (2) - Evidence-Based Program:

- Program: Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring
- Alignment with Florida Definition: Yes, this program aligns with Florida's definition due to its screening and progress monitoring components.
- Alignment with District's Reading Plan: This program aligns with the district's reading plan, focusing on assessing reading progress.

- Alignment with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards: It aligns with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards by targeting students' reading proficiency.

3rd Grade (3) - Evidence-Based Program:

- Program: Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring
- Alignment with Florida Definition: Yes, this program aligns with Florida's definition due to its emphasis on screening and progress monitoring.
- Alignment with District's Reading Plan: This program aligns with the district's reading plan, which involves critical reading assessment components.
- Alignment with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards: It aligns with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards by focusing on students' reading proficiency.

4th and 5th Grade - Evidence-Based Program:

- Program: Flying Classroom (STEAM+ supplemental curriculum)
- Alignment with Florida Definition: This program aligns with Florida's definition as it offers a unique approach to teaching STEAM subjects and is expected to show growth in critical thinking.
- Alignment with District's Reading Plan: While Flying Classroom focuses on STEAM subjects, it complements the district's reading plan by developing critical thinking and literacy skills.
- Alignment with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards: It aligns with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards by enhancing critical thinking and literacy, which are fundamental to ELA.

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 selected practices/programs have been chosen based on their alignment with the evidence-based definitions of strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence. They address the identified need of improving student outcomes, especially in reading proficiency. Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring is well-established, and Flying Classroom offers an innovative STEAM+ curriculum to enhance students' critical thinking skills. The resources and criteria used for selection include research evidence, previous success, and alignment with Florida's educational standards.

These practices/programs have demonstrated effectiveness in improving student outcomes, and they are expected to have a positive impact on the target population of students in each grade, ultimately helping them achieve the desired proficiency levels in ELA.

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>To address the school's Area(s) of Focus, particularly in the context of literacy, we will implement the following action steps in each category:</p> <p>Literacy Leadership:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership Team Formation: We have a dedicated literacy leadership team comprising of our Curriculum Specialist, our Literacy Coach, and our New Teacher Mentor. These experienced educators demonstrate a strong commitment to literacy improvement. This team also includes the principal and assistant principals. The rationale for this step is to ensure that there is a clear structure for guiding and overseeing literacy initiatives. 2. Strategic Literacy Planning: The leadership team developed a comprehensive literacy improvement plan that aligns with district and state goals. This plan outlines specific strategies and goals for improving literacy across all grades. The rationale here is to provide a clear roadmap for literacy enhancement and to ensure that all stakeholders are working towards a common vision. Each grade level has a different goal in relation to their need to achieve proficiency. 3. Regular Data Review: The leadership team schedules regular curriculum meetings to review literacy-related data, including student performance, assessment results, and progress monitoring. Data analysis informs decision-making and helps adjust strategies as needed. The rationale for this step is to maintain a data-driven approach to literacy improvement. 	<p>Paz, Frances, paz.frances@franklin-academy.org</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development for Coach: The literacy coach undergoes constant specialized training and professional development to enhance her expertise in literacy instruction. This training always focuses on the latest evidence-based practices, instructional strategies, and assessment tools. 2. One-on-One Support: The literacy coach works closely with teachers, providing one-on-one support and guidance to improve instructional techniques. She observes classroom instruction, provides feedback, and helps teachers implement effective literacy strategies tailored to individual classroom needs. 3. Teacher Collaboration: The literacy coach facilitates collaboration among teachers within and across grade levels to share best practices and innovative approaches to literacy instruction. Regular meetings and workshops encourage the exchange of ideas and experiences. 	<p>Paz, Frances, paz.frances@franklin-academy.org</p>
<p>Assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment Review: The school conducts a thorough review of its assessment practices to ensure they are aligned with the district's and state's ELA standards. This review identifies any gaps or areas for improvement in the assessment framework. 2. Data Analysis Workshops: Teachers and administrators will receive training in data analysis techniques. They will deepen their understanding of how to interpret assessment results and use them to inform instruction and intervention strategies. 3. Progress Monitoring System: A robust progress monitoring system is already established, 	<p>Paz, Frances, paz.frances@franklin-academy.org</p>

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
with periodic assessments to track students' growth and identify those who may be falling behind. The data from these assessments is used to trigger timely interventions, as well as organizing small group instruction and determine classroom rotations.	
<p>Professional Learning:</p> <p>1. In-Service Workshops: Regular in-service workshops will be conducted for teachers to provide ongoing professional learning opportunities. These workshops will focus on specific areas of literacy instruction, incorporating evidence-based practices.</p> <p>2. New Teacher Mentor: A mentorship program is already established and a New Mentor Teacher position is the key component. This New Mentor Teacher is part of our Support Staff, and her time is dedicated to developing both our new and our experienced teachers, fostering a culture of continuous learning. Observations and feedback sessions are part of this coaching/mentor role.</p> <p>3. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): Teachers participate in PLCs where they can collaborate on literacy instruction, share resources, and collectively problem-solve. These communities will encourage a culture of shared expertise and support.</p>	Paz, Frances, paz.frances@franklin-academy.org

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.

SIP/Title 1 Addendum will be disseminated through SWIFT/PS communication and reviewed during SAC (School Advisory Council) meetings in fall and Spring. Documents will be available for review in the our school front office and website. <https://ppk12.franklin-academy.org/title-i>

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))

Monthly Parent Academy Sessions take place on campus and virtually. Families are invited and input is encouraged during during SAC (School Advisory Council) meetings in fall and Spring. Documents will be available for review in the our school front office and website. <https://ppk12.franklin-academy.org/title-i>

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))

Franklin Academy funding allocations will be generated through Title 1 Funds. Allocating for additional instructional support as interventionists and support staff to assist with small group instruction and RTI/iii time allocated in teachers schedules. Additional resources and curriculum has also been purchased to support our areas of focus.

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))

This plan was developed considering all students including all ages, grades, and socio-economic status.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No