Myrtle Grove Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Myrtle Grove Elementary School

6115 LILLIAN HWY, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.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.

The mission of Myrtle Grove Elementary School is to provide students with an academic and social skills foundation which will effectively develop communication, cooperation, creativity, and critical thinking skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students to positively impact their community and become lifelong learners.

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
Hoyland, Gina	Assistant Principal	
Jernigan, Savannah	Other	
Pierce, Ann	Other	
Quinlan, Susie	School Counselor	
Maloy, Robin	Principal	
Lawson, Carrie	Other	

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.

Myrtle Grove involves stakeholders in the process by holding School Advisory Meetings and giving families the opportunity to provide input in person, through forms sent home, and through google forms linked on class dojo.

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))

The SIP will be regularly monitored by revisiting our Areas of Focus and action steps. The administrative team will meet monthly to review the progress of the SIP and then will determine if revisions are needed based on current available student progress monitoring data.

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	56%
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)* 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: D 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	16	25	30	30	19	17	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	8	6	11	13	3	0	0	0	41
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	7	11	9	1	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	19	11	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	19	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	4	17	21	4	5	0	0	0	55

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	4	7	13	8	3	0	0	0	35

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	6	4	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	9	29	24	28	13	25	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	1	6	3	4	1	6	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	13	3	4	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	12	9	5	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	7	40	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	9	46	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	11	11	22	7	40	0	0	0	95

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	4	4	11	4	16	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4

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	9	29	24	28	13	25	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	1	6	3	4	1	6	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	13	3	4	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	12	9	5	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	7	40	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	9	46	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	11	11	22	7	40	0	0	0	95

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	4	4	11	4	16	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	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*	34	48	53	30	51	56	34		
ELA Learning Gains				41			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			28		
Math Achievement*	35	50	59	26	46	50	25		
Math Learning Gains				35			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32			39		
Science Achievement*	37	52	54	31	52	59	22		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		62	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	143
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	226
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	4	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	4	2
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	35	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	
FRL	36	Yes	2	

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	22	Yes	3	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	3	1
HSP	54			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	29	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	28	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	34			35			37					
SWD	16			20			6				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			30			11				4	
HSP	39			35			46				3	
MUL	33			33			40				3	
PAC												
WHT	35			40			48				4	
FRL	34			36			36				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	30	41	31	26	35	32	31					
SWD	20	30	8	13	24	25	31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	12	31	40	16	23	29	8					
HSP	52	68		39	56							
MUL	27	41		15	28		36					
PAC												
WHT	42	38		36	42		50					
FRL	22	37	32	22	31	36	17					

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	34	26	28	25	26	39	22					
SWD	15	8		18	31		17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	20		9	20		7					
HSP	40			50								
MUL	36			20								
PAC												
WHT	43	37		33	17		29					
FRL	26	24	24	19	25	40	15					

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	35%	49%	-14%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	27%	44%	-17%	50%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	31%	51%	-20%	59%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	47%	-15%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	51%	-14%	51%	-14%

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.

37.2% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in Math on the PM 3 FAST which is a 20.8% gap from the State average. Contributing factors include a low 3rd grade group with academic gaps and deficiencies (this group was in Kindergarten the year COVID began). There were novice teachers to the grade level, which brings a need for an increase in the development of pedagogical skills. Another contributing factor was this grade level having a teacher with medical issues which created the need for a substitute teacher. The teacher vacancy and the difficulty of finding substitutes, created an environment of uncertainty as well as an inconsistency in the instructional learning path. The ESSA subroups of SWD and black students performed especially low in Math. One contributing factor for the SWD data was the vacancy of an ESE teacher for the majority of the school year. Due to this vacancy, there was a larger student caseload for the other teachers providing support, which leads to a decrease in the consistency and intensity of students receiving services.

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

Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 had a decline of 4.8% in ELA proficiency and students with disabilities in 5th grade had a decline of 24.7% proficiency in Science. One contributing factor is the computer versus human read aloud accommodation provided to students. Another contributing factor for the SWD data was the vacancy of an ESE teacher for the majority of the school year. Due to this vacancy, there was a larger student caseload for the other teachers providing support, which leads to a

decrease in the consistency and intensity of students receiving services.
The ESE teachers were included in the planning with STO on a weekly basis. Support opportunities for SWD students were intense interventions for reading, with specific programs, such as Sunday System and Phonics Chip Kit. The students received interventions in a small group setting and within a quiet learning environment. The ESE support teachers attended weekly collaborative planning with the STO coaches, as well as worked within the grade level content to help students use skills and strategies to better understand the rigorous academic vocabulary. ESE teachers also provided inclusive support within the classrooms for both the reading and most of the math instructional blocks.

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.

5th Grade ELA had a proficiency rate of 33.8% which is a 21.2% gap from the state average. 3rd Grade Math had a proficiency rate of 33.8% which is a 25.2% gap from the state average. Contributing factors include a low 3rd grade group with academic gaps and deficiencies (this group was in Kindergarten the year COVID began). There were novice teachers to the grade level, which brings a need for an increase in the development of pedagogical skills. Another contributing factor was this grade level having a teacher with medical issues which created the need for a substitute teacher. The teacher vacancy and the difficulty of finding substitutes, created an environment of uncertainty as well as an inconsistency in the instructional learning path.

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

African American/Black students in 3rd-5th grades improved by 18.2 percentage points in proficiency in Math from the 2021-22 FSA to the 2022-23 FAST PM3 Assessment. 21-22 was 12% proficient and 22-23 was 30.2% proficient. Planning was intentional in 3rd-5th grades. Coaching from School Transformation Office coaches and school administration was facilitated utilizing the Get Better Faster waterfall.

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

Attendance and Behavior schoolwide
Our Guidance Counselor checks attendance on a weekly basis. She sends out attendance letters when students accrue 10 absences (excused or unexcused). She schedules Child Study Attendance meetings with the parents, administration, and School Social Worker. She sends attendance letters to students in the RtI process who have been absent regularly. We are working with the Homeless Department to ensure that Homeless students have the resources needed and are attending school. The majority of our Homeless students and RtI students are Level 1 students. We have developed FBA/PBIPs for students with severe behavior challenges. I have sent an additional staff member to FBA/PBIP training.

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

Increase ELA proficiency
Increase Math proficiency
Improve attendance
Decrease the number of behavior referrals

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Based on our Early Warning System, behaviors and attendance are issues. In the 2022-23 school year, we averaged 146 students (35%) that were absent 5 or more days. We averaged 38 students (9%) with Office Discipline Referrals during the 2022-23 school year.

The effects of poor attendance are particularly pronounced among low-income children, who need more time in the classroom to master reading and are less likely to have access to resources outside of school
to help them catch up. Unfortunately, low-income children are four times more likely to be chronically absent. Based on our Early Warning System, behaviors and attendance are issues.

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

We will decrease the number of students with 5 or more absences to an average of 30% and the average number of ODRs to 5% during the 2023-24 school year.

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

The school leadership team will monitor attendance and behavior data weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

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.)

1) The behavior team will analyze PMDR data, PBIP's, ESE IEP's, and other behavior data. The team will meet with teachers at the beginning of the year to discuss student behavior and data directly tied to student disabilities pertaining to data. The team will then meet monthly with teachers to discuss data to inform next steps.
2) The leadership will establish school-wide protocols for attendance and behavior. The protocols will be monitored by data review and class walks. Teachers and students will receive feedback about attendance and behavior on a monthly basis.

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

10 Key Policies and Practices for Schoolwide and Classroom-Based
Behavioral Supports with strong evidence of effectiveness from high-quality research, University of Texas, 2017
Attendance in the Early Grades: Why it Matters for Reading
Attendance Works and the Campaign for Grade-Level Reading, February 2014. This brief summarizes a growing body of research which documents how many youngsters are chronically absent, meaning they miss 10 percent or more of the school year due to excused or unexcused absences. The research also shows how these missed days, as early as preschool, translate into weaker reading skills.
Published: February 2014

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.

The behavior (PBIS) team will analyze PMDR data, PBIP's, ESE IEP's, and other behavior data. The team will meet with teachers at the beginning of the year to discuss student behavior and data directly tied to student disabilities pertaining to data. The team will then meet monthly with teachers to discuss data to inform next steps.

Person Responsible: Savannah Jernigan (sjernigan1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

The PBIS plan will be implemented school-wide, building in incentives on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Savannah Jernigan (sjernigan1@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

Each teacher will make at least one positive call home to each student within their classes once per month. The teacher will log these calls on a parent contact form.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Monthly

Our Guidance Counselor checks attendance on a weekly basis. She sends out attendance letters when students accrue 10 absences (excused or unexcused). She schedules Child Study Attendance meetings with the parents, administration, and School Social Worker. She sends attendance letters to students in the RtI process who have been absent regularly. We are working with the Homeless Department to ensure that Homeless students have the resources needed and are attending school. The majority of our Homeless students and RtI students are Level 1 students.

Person Responsible: Susie Quinlan (dquinlan@ecsdfl.us)

By When: On going throughout the year.

#2. 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.

In analyzing the 2023 FAST data , historical ESSA data, and by using the gap analysis, we determined there is a need for a clear, measurable, visible, and data-driven differentiated instruction within the math and science content areas. On the 22-23 PM3 FAST, 37.2% of 3rd-5th graders were proficient in Math. In Science, 36.8% of 5th graders were proficient on the 22-23 NGSSS assessment. In order to increase student achievement in Math and Science to reflect on or above grade level as measured by PM3 on the FAST, a combination of systematic, explicit instruction that provides differentiated opportunities will ensure the success of this goal.
According to10 Key Mathematics Practices for All Elementary Schools found on What Works Clearinghouse, systematic, explicit instruction in combination with differentiated instruction opportunities, proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance.

*Proficiency levels indicated for 2023 are based on levels set as of July 2023.

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

The overall Math proficiency* will go from 37.2% on the 2023 FAST to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST assessment and ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%, including SWD, African American/Black, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, Multiracial, and Hispanic students.

The overall Science proficiency* will go from 36.8% on the 2023 NGSSS assessment to 41% or higher on the 2024 NGSSS assessment and ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%, including SWD, African American/Black, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, Multiracial, and Hispanic students.

*Proficiency levels indicated for 2023 are based on levels set as of July 2023.

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

The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be district science and math assessments, school-based assessments, and academic monitoring formative assessments.

The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school- wide data monthly. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

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.)

1) Strengthen differentiated Tier I instructional delivery through use of: the Science and MathFramework, B1G-M Instructional Guides, and hands-on Labs.
2) Schools will increase teacher knowledge on use of assessment data to drive instruction, including using assessment to enhance student learning, beyond just measuring it.

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

1) 10 Key Mathematics Practices for All Elementary Schools with strong evidence of effectiveness from high-quality research University of Texas, 2017 and Elementary Math (10 Key Practices). (Tier 1)
2) Policies and Assessments in Schools (Tier 1)

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.

Planning:
1) Utilize the BIG M to identify instructional strategies to support benchmark aligned instruction and tiered strategies to support differentiation.
2) Utilize the MTR's (Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning) to engage students in discussing mathematical thinking and reasoning.
3) Teachers will incorporate labs and/or hands-on activities at least weekly into the curriculum. THe STO team will support this effort with example labs/activities and training on implementation.
4) Planning with teachers on a weekly basis. The district and school-based leadership team will utilize a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: on-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Classroom Walkthrough/Feedback:
1) The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes.
2) The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and class walks.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: weekly

Coaching:
1) Coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points.

Math: The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, word problems and student discourse.

Science: The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, abstract to concrete representations of science concepts, primary and secondary source analysis, academic language, and student discourse.

2) Coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and STO team to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: on-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Data:
1) The leadership team will analyze data from screening and progress monitoring assessments and identify trends.
2) The leadership team will meet with teachers to share school- wide data.
3) Teachers will utilize scientific probes provided by District Personal or the teacher themselves to check

for student understanding including bellringers, exit tickets, and "do now" prompts scripted into lessons.
4) Teachers will use benchmark-specific active academic monitoring, circulating to check specific student responses and record data on a spreadsheet by student.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: on-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 30.4% on the 2023 FAST.
Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 56.5% on the 2023 FAST.
Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 33.8% on the 2023 FAST.
Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has not reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:
Economically Disadvantaged (37.5%)
Students with Disabilities (15.2%)
African American (35.2%)
Multiracial (29.2%)

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

ELA proficiency will go from 38.2% proficiency* on the 2023 FAST to 45% or higher on the 2024 FAST PM3 school-wide. ESSA subgroups include SWD, African American/Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Multiracial students. ELA proficiency for ESSA subgroups will increase by 50%.

*proficiency levels indicated for 2023 are based on levels set as of July 2023

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

1. To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter on FAST. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree. For Grades 3-5 we will analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.
2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Grade 3 to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Literacy Practice Profile tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

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.)

Myrtle Grove uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program. The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components Into Reading meets Florida' s definition of evidence-based.The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.
In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.
Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and RtI teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

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

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

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.

Literacy Leadership-
Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.
Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.
Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Literacy Coaching-
District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate use of the literacy practice profiles in the delivery of instruction with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.
Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Assessment
Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.
Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Professional Learning -
We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:

Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees
Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period. UniSIG funds will be utilized to purchase Phonics for Reading, Magnetic Reading, and Measure Up! supplemental materials will be used to support ELA interventions
Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan
The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading.

Person Responsible: Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

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).

Funding allocations for Title I funds are based on survey 3 poverty data. Schools receive these allocations in the spring and work with Title I and the level directors to determine how those funds are utilized. Title I schools also receive additional funding for low income students to support parent involvement. UniSIG allocations are based on school grade and overall Federal Index rates and are received in late summer. The schools work with the School Transformation Office (STO) and level directors to determine the usage of these funds to maximize impact on student achievement. Both Title I and UniSIG are aligned so there are no resource duplications between these two main school improvement funding sources. The Human Resource Department works with Budgeting, Finance, Title I, STO, and Executive staff to review staffing to ensure schools in need have staffing that reflects the need of the school. Title I, UniSIG, Reading Allocation, ESSER, and SAI funding sources are utilized to add supplemental positions to meet the needs of schools and align to state and district goals. School Improvement funding allocations are also utilized to pay staff to attend planning sessions and professional development sessions with the Professional Development Department and STO based on input from BSI and the district. The district identifies resources for coaching and planning support through the level directors, School Transformation Office, Title I, and Professional Development Department. Schools are tiered based on need including school grade, overall federal index, graduation rates, and ESSA subgroup data. Supplemental resources in addition to the district purchased core resources are reviewed based on the school need and approved for purchase utilizing school improvement funding and SAI funding. The district has also begun to utilize Canvas as the LMS to help support resource allocation to include benchmark aligned lessons, professional development, and content training for schools. Additional support that is identified by quarterly meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
18% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
41% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
42% of Second grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Students who score below the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are not considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2022-2023 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
Third grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 70% on the 2023 FAST.
Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 43% on the 2023 FAST.
Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 67% on the 2023 FAST.

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

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2023 will increase for grades kindergarten through 2nd grade to 50% or higher on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The ELA proficiency rate will increase for grades third through fifth to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2024 FAST PM3.

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.

To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.
a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom. (See FOCUS report)
c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart. (See Amira)
d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.

2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Florida Literacy Practice Profiles.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Maloy, Robin, rmaloy@ecsdfl.us

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?

Myrtle Grove uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP)
The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how Into Reading

meets Florida' s definition of evidence-based.The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.

In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.

Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and RtI teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

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 use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

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
Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership- Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth. Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing. Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve. Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching- District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate use of the literacy practice profiles in the delivery of instruction with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing. Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support. Action Step 3: Assessment Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention. Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring. Action Step 4: Professional Learning - We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following: Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period. Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading.	Maloy, Robin, rmaloy@ecsdfl.us

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.

In addition to the SIP being available on the school website (https://www.escambiaschools.org/mges), copies will be made available in the front office for anyone who requests one. It will be shared and discussed at School Advisory Meetings and Faculty Meetings. Teachers will share progress with parents at conferences and at family nights.

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))

The PFEP will be available at https://www.escambiaschools.org/mges. Families will be included in various curriculum nights at school. Parents will keep families informed of their students' progress through phone calls, class dojo, and conferences.

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)

We have created a master schedule which utilizes bell to bell instruction. Teachers also have 2 days of common planning time during the school day and will have extra planning time 2 days a week specifically related to ELA and Math and 5th grade Science. Intentional, focused planning will strengthen our academic program by allowing teachers to plan lessons based on the BEST standards. Weekly walkthroughs by the admin team will allow us to give teachers targeted feedback in areas of concern and increase the effectiveness of the implementation of lessons.

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))

IDEA: Provides students with disabilities a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) that is tailored to their individual needs including an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), appropriate evaluation, parent and teacher participation, and procedural safeguards.

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))

We have a navigator and guidance counselor who work closely with our families to ensure that physical and emotional needs are met.

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))

NA

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).

All staff members contribute to MGE's friendly environment. We set the tone through our actions and attitudes. Our support and encouragement will be demonstrated through four important procedures:
1. We will teach students expectations for responsible behavior in every school environment by relating student actions to our Tiger Expectations.
2. We will provide positive feedback to students when they are meeting expectations and following the guidelines for success.
3. When minor misbehavior does occur, staff will view the misbehavior as a teaching opportunity, responding with calm, consistent corrections, or consequences.
4. We will work collaboratively to solve problems that are chronic or severe in nature.

Establishing a sense of responsibility and discipline is an on-going process. The procedures stated in this manual will facilitate school wide procedures and expectations. Staff must work continuously to achieve as much consistency as possible and be prepared to revise and adapt procedures as needed to keep the process alive. Our PBIS team will meet on a regular basis, seek input from staff, students, and parents on possible improvement and will facilitate a yearly review of procedures.

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))

We are doing a book study on Emotional Poverty to assist teachers with instruction. We have iReady professional development and teachers and paraprofessionals participate in grade level planning (weekly) and data meetings (monthly).

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))

We currently have an ESE PreK class on campus. Transition meetings are held when those students are ready to go to Kindergarten, either gen ed or the self contained class. Kindergarten screenings take place before school begins so that students and families can meet their teacher and visit the campus.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$151,678.83
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	510	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,300.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Supplies to support professional development for student engagement strategies by School Transformation Instructional Coaches (Kagan Collaborative Structures supplies 30 teachers x $100 (Kagan Collaborative book $44, Posters $14, Kagan flip book $29) plus 10% shipping			
	6300	750	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,000.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Planning for Long Term substitutes to attend planning with school-based administration and School Transformation Instructional Coaches			
	6300	100	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$119,000.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Stipends to pay teachers to attend after-school planning with school-based coaches, administrators, and School Transformation Office coaches $33 per hour x 30 teachers x 3 hours per week x 4 weeks x 10 months			
	6300	210	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$16,121.16
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Retirement for stipends to pay teachers to attend after-school planning with school-based coaches, administrators, and School Transformation Office coaches 30 teachers x 3 hours per week x 4 weeks x 10 months x $33 x .1357			
	6300	220	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,027.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Social Security for stipends to pay teachers to attend after-school planning with school-based coaches, administrators, and School Transformation Office coaches $33 per hour x 30 teachers x 3 hours per week x 4 weeks x 8 months x .0765			
	6300	240	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,416.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Workers Comp for stipends to pay teachers to attend after-school planning with school-based coaches, administrators, and School Transformation Office coaches $33 per hour x 30 teachers x 3 hours per week x 4 weeks x 10 months x .012			
	5100	520	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,814.67
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 Measure Up Math supplemental workbooks to support small group instruction 95 student books x $14.95 per book			
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$35,538.72**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	520	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$856.46
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Phonics for Reading to support ELA interventions with 3rd-5th 5 packs x $45 x 3 grade levels = $675 2 teacher editions x 3 grade levels x $14.95 =$89.70 10% shipping =$91.75			
	5100	510	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,500.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Science Supplies to support benchmark-aligned instruction (Graduated cylinders, balance scales, planet models, clay, rulers, beakers sets, pan balance, spring scale, thermometers, meter sticks, foam bowls, paper plates, string/yarn, clear plastic cups, safety goggles, magnets, iron washers, gravel, quart bags, magnifying glasses, mineral kit)			
	5100	510	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,859.82
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Office Supplies to support benchmark-aligned instruction. (Chart paper, paper, pencils, notebooks ,staplers, staples, composition books, clipboards, sticky notes, paper fasteners, sticky flags, manual hole punch, post-it notes, binders, binder clips)			
	5100	519	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,642.77

			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Ink/toner to support benchmark-aligned instruction.			
	5100	520	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$8,415.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Magnetic Reading supplemental ELA workbooks to support the intervention hour. 450 books x $15 per book = $6750 30 teachers x $30 per TE = $900 10% shipping = $765			
	5100	520	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,814.67
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 Measure Up ELA supplemental workbooks to support small group instruction 95 student books x $14.95 per book 13 teacher editions x $16.50 10% shipping			
	5100	369	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,460.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 33 Go Guardian software is utilized to monitor students' technology usage during small group instruction 400 students x $3.65			
	7800	798	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,990.00
			Notes: Myrtle Grove ES UniSIG SIP: Focus 2 and 3 The field trip to the State Capitol and Mission San Luis is planned to support instructional activities to engage students and provide a learning experience that can not be duplicated in a classroom. Student field trip - transportation 2 buses x $2,995 = $5,990 Location: Tallahassee: State Capitol and Mission San Luis No admission fees			
					Total:	**$187,217.55**

Budget Approval

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

No