

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Oakleaf Junior High

4085 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://olj.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Oakleaf Junior High School is to provide a safe, appropriate, and effective learning environment that will meet the needs of students and assist students in the accomplishment of educational goals that are significant in the workplace and for higher learning pursuits.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Oakleaf Junior High exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Dixon, Wilnitra	Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and insure proper security, maintenance and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including: interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, ELL, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, F.A.S.T. Assessments, End-of-Course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students and community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the school district.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Freeman, Josh	Assistant Principal	<p>Manages school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place. Collaborates with the School Principal to generate a master schedule in alignment with District and State expectations for student achievement. Ensure appropriate staff members are trained for the administration of local and state assessments for students. Serves as a lead for PLC content area groups. In addition, serves as an active member of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), Administrative Team, and conducts classroom walkthroughs to provide teachers with instructional support.</p>
LaFontant, Florence	Assistant Principal	<p>Manages school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place. Collaborates with the School Principal to determine core needs for Support Facilitators and self contained classrooms to ensure student needs are met for students with disabilities. Serves as a lead for PLC content area groups. Serves as an active member of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), Administrative Team, and conducts classroom walkthroughs to provide teachers with instructional support. In addition, Mrs. Lafontant manages student discipline concerns and serves as the lead for the PBIS team.</p>
Elia, Mike	Assistant Principal	<p>Manages school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place. Collaborates with the School Principal to determine core needs for Support Facilitators and self contained classrooms to ensure student needs are met for students with disabilities. Serves as a lead for PLC content area groups. Mr. Elia is the chairperson for the School Safety Team, by leading the team with the completion of threat assessments. Serves as the lead for compliance of school drills and documentation. Also, collaborates with the district to ensure proper maintenance of school facilities with the completion of work orders. Serves as an active member of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), Administrative Team, and conducts classroom walkthroughs to provide teachers with instructional support. In addition, manages student discipline concerns and assists as an active member of the PBIS team.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Improvement Plan is constructed utilizing input from the School Advisory Council (SAC). The SAC consists of school administrators, instructional staff, support staff, parents, and business partners from the community. Input from members of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), the Literacy Team, Positive Behavior & Intervention Supports (PBIS) Team, school administrators, and instructional staff feedback gathered from end of year meetings. Each team and department will utilize action planning templates to provide ongoing feedback for mid-year updates and the construction of the next school improvement plan.

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 monitored on a monthly basis using the following methods:

- *SAC meetings-school-wide data will be provided for review, discussion, and next steps
- *School committee meetings (PBIS, Literacy, SBLT)
- *The Oakleaf Junior High Professional Learning Community (PLC)
- *School Based Leadership Team Meetings(SBLT)
- *School Data Reviews (quarterly)
- *Administration Team Meetings (weekly)

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	112	204	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	110	230	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	126	180	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	77	108	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	117	194	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	62	109	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	111	173	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	70	102	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	130	283	

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	94	189	

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	62	109	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	111	173	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	70	102	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	130	283	

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	94	189	

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	54	49	57	56	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				50			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			41		
Math Achievement*	65	69	56	58	33	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				56			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			27		
Science Achievement*	60	62	49	62	64	53	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	81	68	81	59	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	57	63	73	63	46	49	62		
Graduation Rate					63	49			
College and Career Acceleration					81	70			
ELP Progress	55	44	40	44	67	76	39		

* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	29	Yes	2	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	54			
HSP	62			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	69			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	49			
HSP	56			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	49			

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	53			65			60	79	57			55
SWD	18			31			22	53	19		5	
ELL	25			37			39	57	36		6	55
AMI												
ASN	76			88			93	94	67		5	
BLK	43			54			50	71	53		5	
HSP	51			64			61	83	53		6	58
MUL	59			69			76	82	55		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	60			77			63	84	62		5	
FRL	43			55			51	70	45		6	56

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	57	50	33	58	56	49	62	81	63			44
SWD	22	35	26	29	45	44	32	64	36			
ELL	41	43	33	36	51	50	44	83	40			44
AMI												
ASN	83	65		88	79		90	95	89			
BLK	48	44	26	43	54	48	46	72	56			
HSP	58	49	36	57	52	46	61	88	58			
MUL	61	51	29	56	56	46	66	81	58			
PAC												
WHT	62	53	43	70	57	51	76	86	64			
FRL	50	42	27	49	50	48	51	74	47			

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	55	50	41	50	32	27	60	78	62			39
SWD	23	35	31	15	20	22	27	52	23			
ELL	25	44	46	34	37	48	35	65	27			39
AMI												
ASN	78	67		69	33		74	95	73			
BLK	41	41	35	33	25	18	46	71	46			
HSP	52	55	52	49	37	39	57	75	68			29
MUL	54	52	29	54	33	24	63	77	70			
PAC												
WHT	67	54	48	63	37	37	73	86	66			
FRL	44	41	38	38	29	27	48	71	47			27

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
07	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	51%	0%	47%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	48%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	70%	-2%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	44%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	68%	27%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	53%	45%	48%	50%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	73%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	79%	-1%	66%	12%

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.

Based on the review of the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. scores, proficiency in ELA/Reading showed the lowest performance. Both 7th and 8th grade students demonstrated 50% proficiency overall. Contributing factors include the following: limited numbers of Support Facilitators to push into classrooms with students needing support, adjustment to a new testing platform/format, leveling of student classes, and unfilled teaching positions within multiple subject areas for the entire school year.

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

Overall student proficiency decreased from 57% to 50% from the prior year assessment. Contributing factors to this result include the following: limited numbers of Support Facilitators to push into classrooms to provide support for students with disabilities, adjustment to a new testing platform/format, leveling of student classes, and unfilled teaching positions within multiple subject areas for the entire school year. Nearly 36% of all students are identified as students with disabilities.

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.

In comparison with the state average in the following areas: Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary, Reading Informational Text, and Reading Prose and Poetry, there is no significant gap between student performance at Oakleaf Junior High and the state average. In fact, 8th grade students out performed the state with proficiency scores that were three to four percentage points higher in each area.

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

Overall student proficiency in Math showed the most improvement with an 11 point increase from the 2022-2023 school year. The incorporation of the Math Lab for students to receive additional support outside of the math content class time. Student attendance and work were tracked by the Math Lab teacher. In addition, the Math Lab teacher collaborated with the math department Professional Learning Community (PLC) throughout the year to ensure consistency for student learning during lab time. The math department also restructured the PLC by collaborating to develop a vision statement for the math department. The vision focused on what teachers want math classes to look like when observing student work and teacher work. Support Facilitators were consistent with push in support to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Students with disabilities were also served by certified ESE teachers within a Unique Skills course with provided extra support for students to complete assignments in a smaller classroom setting. In addition, student work protocols and common assessment data reviews were held.

The renewed Math PLC structured resulted in smaller teacher groups that allowed for collaboration among teachers covering the same math course. This allowed additional structure for teachers to talk through strategies used to teach concepts along with a detailed look at student learning trends across the classes. Included in the PLC with the math department are the ESE Support Facilitators, District Math Curriculum Specialist, and the Math Department Administrator. Teachers were then able to construct common math assessments based on current student progress and learning trends for the following meeting.

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

Based on Early Warning Systems data, two areas of concern have been identified. The two areas of concern are students that scored a Level 1 in math and ELA/Reading and student attendance below 90%. This is an area of concern due to the number of students performing at a level 1 on the F.A.S.T. Math and ELA/Reading assessments. The data identifies a total of 85 students who earned a Level 1 in both Math and ELA Reading assessments. Within this group 23 of these students are also have attendance that is below 90% for the 2022-2023 school year.

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

1. Student Attendance: Students with attendance rates below 90% will be targeted early to identify barriers that prevent school attendance, clear communication of expectations, and guidance through Student Success Team meetings for families with input from teachers. The school social worker will collaborate with school administrators, school counselors, and teachers to gather input for families to support students.
2. Support Facilitation for Exceptional Education: Students with Individual Education Plans will receive increased levels of support in the math and ELA classrooms with the addition of two more Support Facilitators and intentional scheduling. Some students enrolled in dual certified classes will also benefit from the services of support facilitators in math and/or ELA classes. Whole group collaboration sessions through monthly "Consultation Breakfasts" provides all teachers with the opportunity to connect with the entire team of ESE Support Facilitators and school counselors regarding student progress. Teachers have the opportunity to provide support facilitators with input about student progress while gathering any updates about student plans.
3. Intensive Reading Classes: Students with Level 1 and Level 2 ELA/Reading scores were enrolled into Intensive Reading classes. Due to class and size limitations, students with Level 1 scores were given priority with scheduling. Every student completed a diagnostic to determine placement within specific classes based on levels for the Corrective Reading program. The Corrective Reading program is used for all intensive reading classes. Students identified as active English Language Learners were scheduled into ESOL Intensive Reading classes. ESOL Intensive Reading classes are leveled to meet the needs of all students.
4. Math Support: Student results from the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. Math assessment were reviewed with the math department and administration. Students were scheduled into math classes in accordance with the scheduling guidelines provided by the school district. The Math Lab is maintained by a certified math teacher who serves as a member of the Math Department and Math PLC. The math lab teacher collaborates with math teachers to identify students that need additional math support based on assessments and checks for understanding throughout the course. In addition, F.A.S.T. scores were used to immediately identify Level 1 students who earned a year-long average below a "C". Students attend the math lab for one to two days a week during an elective class to prevent loss of math instructional time. The math lab teacher completed a tour of all math classes at the start of the year to

touch base with all students. Students in advanced classes may also attend math lab sessions for support on the assigned days for advanced courses throughout the school year. The math lab teacher maintains student math lab attendance records and tracks student data (grades, Aleks performance, and Progress Monitoring) for the entire year.

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.

The objective to establishing an effective school-wide discipline plan is to have well defined expectations, ensure consistency with enforcement, and possess the ability to develop and emphasize proactive strategies rather than reactive ones along a continuum of positive behavior supports. An emphasis should be placed on utilizing an instructional and inclusionary approach to discipline, as opposed to reinforcing exclusionary disciplinary practices. Oakleaf Junior High has established H.I.V.E. (Honor, Integrity, Value, and Excellence) as a guide for all staff to outline and students to follow daily.

Establishing and maintaining consistent school-wide expectations with classrooms in alignment will improve student achievement. The objective is to provide structure and consistency in addition to opportunities for student reflection about behaviors. Students will complete lessons and receive support/mentorship throughout the school year in the form of Student Success Teams for any of the following areas: attendance, behaviors, and academic grades. The overall goal is to keep students within active learning environments to maximize learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The objective is to decrease the number of student office referrals for "Defiance and Disrespect" from the previous school year. The PBIS team initiative for consistent school-wide behavior expectations is in place to outline steps for students that need to be redirected while rewarding students for making good choices.

Monitoring:

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

The number of discipline referrals will be tracked using Synergy reports. The PBIS team will continue the tradition of sharing student office discipline referrals quarterly during whole group staff meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Florence LaFontant (florence.lafontant@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Oakleaf Junior High has established H.I.V.E. (Honor, Integrity, Value, and Excellence) as a guide for all staff to outline and students to follow daily. Based on Early Warning System data from the 2022-2023 school year, there was a total of 140 students with disabilities identified that were suspended. Of the 140 students identified, 60 served 1 or more days in In School Suspension (ISS) and 39 served 1 or more days in Out of School Suspension (OSS).

H.I.V.E. expectations have been printed and posted in highly visible areas to outline positive behavior choices for various areas of the school (Gym/Locker Rooms, Cafeteria, Classroom, and Hallways). Students can receive HIVE Coins to purchase items from the HIVE Mart and/or be recognized as the HIVE Student of the Week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of outlining and posting expectations is for students to have a clear, consistent understanding of behavior expectations school-wide. Students receive guidance on the second day of school and again in January to refresh school expectations for good behavior. Examples of expectations

(good choices) and behaviors that are prohibited for clarity. The objective is to ensure students are aware of expectations to reduce the number of infractions to prevent instructional time lost due to suspensions.

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. Establish Positive Behavior Intervention Support Team with instructional and support staff members.
2. Create list of positive behavior expectations for specific areas: hallways, classrooms, cafeteria, etc.
3. Post positive behavior expectations in visible areas for students. Provide posters for each classroom.
4. Complete PBIS follow up training with team members.
5. Introduce students to expectations during Buzz Camp (July).
6. Share procedures and plan with staff during pre-planning week.
7. Conduct beginning of year assembly to outline positive expectations for students.
8. Provide staff members with H.I.V.E. Coins to reward positive student behavior.
9. Open the H.I.V.E. Mart during lunch periods for students to use H.I.V.E. coins.
10. Administration collaboration with Dean of Student Culture to develop plan to track student discipline. Student discipline referral data is shared quarterly during a Whole Group meeting. Follow up with meetings to review data and plan next steps to meet student needs.

Person Responsible: Florence LaFontant (florence.lafontant@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monitoring and feedback occur monthly during PBIS team meetings and quarterly with a whole group PLC meeting.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Overall student proficiency in Math showed the most improvement with an 11 point increase from the 2022-2023 school year. Students with disabilities were also served by certified ESE teachers within a Unique Skills course with provided extra support for students to complete assignments in a smaller classroom setting. In addition, student work protocols and common assessment data reviews were held.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goals for the 2023-2024 school year are:

1. Increase student proficiency on the Math 2 F.A.S.T. Assessment from 45% to 50%.
2. Increase student proficiency on the Math 3 F.A.S.T. Assessment from 60% to 65%.
3. Increase student proficiency on the Algebra EOC from 96% to 98%.
4. Increase student proficiency on the Geometry EOC from 99% to 100%

Monitoring:

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

1. Use of the Math Lab during elective classes to provide students with additional support.
2. Classroom Walkthroughs
3. Professional Learning Community for Math teachers to address the following essential questions:
 - *What do we want students to learn?
 - *How will we know when students have learned the material?
 - *What do we respond to students who do not learn the material?
 - *How will we push students who have mastered/learned the material?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Support Facilitator push in support for Inclusion and Dual Certified math classrooms.
2. Math Lab for students to receive math tutoring for work completion and to re-teach math concepts during the school day outside of the math class.
3. Unique Skills class for students with individual education plan to receive small group support in the areas of math and ELA.
4. Professional Learning Community with a renewed vision for math instruction for the department.
5. Administrator Walkthroughs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The incorporation of the Math Lab for students to receive additional support outside of the math content class time. Student attendance and work were tracked by the Math Lab teacher. In addition, the Math Lab teacher collaborated with the math department Professional Learning Community (PLC) throughout the year to ensure consistency for student learning during lab time.

The vision focused on what teachers want math classes to look like when observing student work and teacher work. Support Facilitators were consistent with push in support to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The renewed Math PLC resulted in smaller teacher groups that allowed collaboration among teachers covering the same math course. The additional structure for teachers to talk through strategies

used to teach concepts along with a detailed look at student learning trends across the classes. The PLC will include ESE Support Facilitators, District Math Curriculum Specialist, and the Math Department Administrator. The use of common assessments will help teachers define and track trends.

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.

Consistently conduct walkthroughs with intentional focus areas based on the OneClay Instructional Vision and provide teachers with next steps to foster best practices to maximize student learning during the

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Walkthroughs will occur on a daily basis. Administration will have weekly meetings to review classroom walkthrough trends. Prescribed next steps review and teacher follow up will occur weekly.

Work collaboratively with content area curriculum specialists (Matz & Randall) and Support Facilitator to ensure the continuous development of effective instructional strategies in alignment with the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards. This will be monitored with regular attendance and assistance with teacher development during Content Area PLC time as a small group team by specific math course, whole group with best practices for instruction centered around the quarterly focus outlined in the OneClay Vision for Strong Instruction, and during all day trainings with the content area specialists.

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: This will be monitored and feedback will be provided on a monthly basis.

Monitor student attendance to Math Lab and progress based on student grades and progress monitoring assessments. During the first quarter, students with a Level 1 on the F.A.S.T. PM 3 Assessment and students with a "D" average for the previous year will be pulled for math lab assistance two days a week during an elective class.

Additional students will be pulled based on need and the math lab teacher will collaborate with the math department during PLC planning time to ensure alignment within the curriculum guide and review student data.

A "Zero Detention" option is also available for students to attend the math lab to complete missing assignments once a week.

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly based on student need.

Utilize data from Progress Monitoring assessments 1 and 2 in addition to the review of student work on checks for understanding and/or classroom assessments to identify trends in student performance. Monthly content PLC meetings will include Support Facilitators to discuss student progress and needs. This data will be used to determine next steps regarding opportunities to reteach lessons, math lab assistance, and/or needed teacher development in the content area to increase student achievement in math.

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: February 2024

#3. 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.

Overall student proficiency decreased from 57% to 50% from the prior year assessment. Contributing factors to this result include the following: limited numbers of Support Facilitators to push into classrooms to provide support for students with disabilities, adjustment to a new testing platform/format, leveling of student classes, and unfilled teaching positions within multiple subject areas for the entire school year. Nearly 36% of all students are identified as students with disabilities. A total of 73 students identified as students with disabilities scored a Level 1 on the ELA/Reading F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase overall proficiency from 50% to 55% for both 7th and 8th grade students.

Monitoring:

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

The following steps will be used to monitor student performance in ELA/Reading.

1. Classroom Walkthroughs Intensive Reading Classes
2. Monitoring/tracking student progress in the Intensive Reading student data dashboard, Lexia, Progress Monitoring Assessments, and Synergy student grade reports
3. Support Facilitator push in support for ELA classrooms to meet student needs during whole and small group learning opportunities
4. Data chats
5. Professional Learning Community activities for collaborative planning and review of student data
6. ELA and Intensive Reading team collaboration with district specialists regarding planning, best instructional practices, curriculum materials, and lesson suggestions when needed for support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wilnitra Dixon (wilnitra.dixon@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Corrective Reading program in use for Intensive Reading classes
2. Classroom Walkthroughs
3. Professional Learning Community for ELA and Reading teachers to address the following essential questions:
 - *What do we want students to learn?
 - *How will we know when students have learned the material?
 - *What do we respond to students who do not learn the material?
 - *How will we push students who have mastered/learned the material?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy allows teachers and administrators to make decisions for next steps instructionally based on current student data.

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. Include ELA teachers and support facilitators in the decision making process of student placement in the master schedule. Support facilitators will assist with the outline of dual certification and support facilitator push in classrooms during the initial stages of master schedule development. This will assist with creating a schedule that maximizes student support within the classroom.
2. Classroom Walkthroughs Intensive Reading Classes and support from district specialist for training based on teacher need.
3. Use student data gathered from the Intensive Reading student data dashboard, Lexia, and Progress Monitoring Assessments to determine student and teacher needs.
4. Support Facilitator push in support for ELA classrooms to meet student needs during whole and small group learning opportunities
5. Professional Learning Community activities for collaborative planning and review of student data.

Person Responsible: Wilnitra Dixon (wilnitra.dixon@myoneclay.net)

By When: February 2024

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).

Resources Needed

*Chromebooks and charging carts to replace outdated devices to meet requirements of the new state assessment platform to complete F.A.S.T. assessments.

Review of School Improvement Funding

- 1-Review of need and resources with the School Based Leadership Team as department chairs will survey teams with needs assessment. The request must align with any of the three objectives for improvement outlined in the SIP. Administration will draft the proposal for funding.
- 2-The proposal will be shared with the School Advisory Council for review and vote.
- 3-The result will be shared with the SBLT for final consensus.
- 4-Items funded and usage/results will be shared with updates at SAC meetings.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes