
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 25 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 27 |

George W. Munroe Elementary School

1850 W KING ST, Quincy, FL 32351

www.gadssdenschools.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.

George W. Munroe will provide intentional high quality instruction that increases student learning and teacher growth through professional collaboration for all learners in a safe and respectful school environment for all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

George W. Munroe's vision is to provide high quality standards-based instruction that prepares and develops students academically and socially beyond their foundational years using a T.E.A.M approach.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Kirkland, Germaine | Principal | To provide leadership in the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment that promotes student success. |
| Lewis, Sonja | Assistant Principal | To assist the school leader with administrative and instructional functions to meet the needs of students and the growth of teachers while carrying out the vision, mission of the school and district. |
| Battles, Linda | Teacher, K-12 | To provide a safe environment in which students progress and meet academic milestones through intentional planning and instruction in addition to the attending leadership team meetings, facilitating grade level meetings, and supporting the vision and mission of the school. |
| Knox, Brittany | Reading Coach | To work collaboratively with administration while working with teachers to include modeling, mentoring, supporting teachers, providing resources, reviewing data, conducting classroom walkthroughs, PLCs, and providing effective strategies for struggling students. |
| Harris, Curlie | Teacher, K-12 | To provide a safe environment in which students progress and meet academic milestones through intentional planning and instruction in addition to the attending leadership team meetings, facilitating grade level meetings, and supporting the vision and mission of the school. |
| Forehand, Gwendolyn | Teacher, K-12 | To provide a safe environment in which students progress and meet academic milestones through intentional planning and instruction in addition to the attending leadership team meetings, facilitating grade level meetings, and supporting the vision and mission of the school. |
| Jones, Heather | Teacher, K-12 | To provide a safe environment in which students progress and meet academic milestones through intentional planning and instruction in addition to the attending leadership team meetings, facilitating grade level meetings, and supporting the vision and mission of the school. |
| Wilson, Brittanica | Teacher, ESE | To partner with teachers and assist students with learning strategies to utilize in the classroom. |

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.

As a school, a School Improvement workshop is conducted prior to the start of school and members of the team are comprised of those faculty and staff who represent the various departments/subject of the school. We draft goals based on previous school year data. These goals and school-wide areas of focus are then shared school-wide where feedback and input is encouraged. The school improvement plan is then shared with our parents and other community stakeholders at our School Advisory Council Meetings. The school has various partnerships with local businesses, Greek organizations and faith-based organizations where we share and discuss our school goals for improvement and how they can support this effort. These are all forums, meetings, and opportunities for our stakeholders to provide input and helpful suggestions as to how we can reach our goals as a school.

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 school improvement plan will be regularly monitored at the school and district level. The school will create and checkpoints for the progression of academic standards by grade level while making sure the implementation of the approved core Reading and Math programs are being taught with fidelity through administrative observations and walkthroughs. State approved Intervention programs for Tier 2 & 3 instruction will also be closely monitored for its effectiveness. As we follow and monitor the data from the core and intervention programs, this will help administration create new task if necessary for greater impact. This will include the adjusting or modifying of curriculum tasks and/or resources to ensure the increase of student achievement. Monitoring will be conducted on a monthly basis so they we can continually identify points of progress and areas of improvements, so we can reevaluate strategic plans of action.

Demographic Data

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-3 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 99% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | Yes |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: F |

| | |
|---|--|
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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 | 55 | 38 | 33 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 |
| One or more suspensions | 7 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 14 | 12 | 8 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Course failure in Math | 15 | 10 | 3 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 88 | 100 | 83 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 372 |

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 | 55 | 44 | 34 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 |

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 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 42 | 22 | 22 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 3 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Course failure in Math | 3 | 18 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 81 | 104 | 80 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 367 |

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 | 35 | 41 | 33 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 42 | 22 | 22 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 3 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Course failure in Math | 3 | 18 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 81 | 104 | 80 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 367 |

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 | 35 | 41 | 33 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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* | 24 | 24 | 53 | 17 | 27 | 56 | 30 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 48 | 37 | 59 | 29 | 36 | 50 | 28 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | | 26 | 54 | | 32 | 59 | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 54 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 62 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 27 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 68 | 59 | 59 | 40 | | | 46 | | |

* 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 | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 164 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 29 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 86 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 3 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 29 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 42 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| HSP | 45 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |

| 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 | 39 | 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 | 24 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 18 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| HSP | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 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 | 24 | | | 48 | | | | | | | | 68 |
| SWD | 23 | | | 41 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | 29 | | | 43 | | | | | | | 4 | 68 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | | | 41 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 28 | | | 56 | | | | | | | 4 | 67 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 22 | | | 46 | | | | | | | 4 | 65 |

| 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 | 17 | | | 29 | | | | | | | | 40 |
| SWD | 24 | | | 24 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 7 | | | 7 | | | | | | | | 40 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 10 | | | 29 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 23 | | | 26 | | | | | | | | 40 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 17 | | | 28 | | | | | | | | 42 |

| 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 | 30 | | | 28 | | | | | | | | 46 |
| SWD | 46 | | | 54 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | | | 13 | | | | | | | | 46 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 35 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 23 | | | 18 | | | | | | | | 44 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | | | 29 | | | | | | | | 38 |

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 |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 22% | 31% | -9% | 50% | -28% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 45% | 0% | 59% | -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.

Based on the current data from 2023-24 school year, the school has shown a small increase in the area of ELA students scoring proficient, but it still remains an area of improvement school-wide. Over several years, our population of economically disadvantaged students are still showing a substantial reading deficiency in Reading at every grade level.

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

Based upon the schools calculations as the most current data is not reflected in the "Data Analysis/ Reflection" section as of yet, we still see that ELA is an area with the greatest need for improvement. Our school data for the 22-23 school year shows that there was a slight increase but not enough to make a significant impact. There is also a need to address or SWD population because of the steady decline in the ELA achievement of these students. Contributing factors in both areas are the foundational gaps that seem to widen with the progression to the next grade level. Other contributing factors are that we are still experiencing the repercussions of the COVID gap where the school experienced chronic absenteeism both in the face to face and virtual settings. The school has and continues to experience a teacher shortage as well as those teachers who are not strong in the Science of Reading, planning strategically for fragile learners, and using data to drive intentional instruction. This is sometimes due to teachers who are teaching out of field, trying to obtain certification, or in-field novice teachers to the profession.

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.

ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The school and district has typically lagged the state because of several contributing factors: teacher shortage in the area due to salaries that are not comparable to neighboring counties, human resources at the school/district level are limited because funds are diverted to increase teacher salaries so we can remain competitive.

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

The current/ unpopulated Math data is the area where the data component showed the most improvement. This previous year, administration decided departmentalize Grade 3. Administration through previous observation and data determined which teachers would teach to their strengths. The teachers immediately were able to narrow their subject area instructional focus and collaborate with an intentional purpose. We also formed a partnership with the PAEC Math Consultant (Kysha Hopkins) who was able to provide consistent support, individual feedback, modeling, and math resources/ manipulatives every two weeks.

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

The number of students with a substantial reading deficiency at each grade level and the number of students absent 10% or more days are definite areas of concern that have to be addressed in our efforts for School Improvement.

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

1. Students with a substantial reading deficiency
2. Intentional and strategic collaborative planning for administration, teachers, and coaches
3. Human resources for Tier 2 & 3 student support/intervention
4. Targeted Professional Development of Teacher Growth and Pedagogy
5. Positive School Climate & Culture for increased retention and recruitment

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**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.

George W. Munroe's school and state F.A.S.T. data indicate that various subgroups are a critical need area for school-wide improvement. Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Hispanic students and Economically Disadvantaged students have all shown a need for improvement in the areas of ELA and Math in previous years. According to the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. PM3 ELA and Math data, students in each subgroup made slight increases in ELA in ELA ranging from 2% to 14% and significant increases in Math ranging from 9% to 20%. The above referenced subgroups are currently performing at a proficiency rate below 30% in Reading as indicated by data for the 2022-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2022-23 school year, the measurable outcome for students with disabilities, African American students, English Language Learners, Hispanic students, and Economically Disadvantaged students will increase their proficiency rate on the state F.A.S.T. ELA by 10% and Math proficiency rate will improve by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators, Guidance Counselor, Reading Coach, District Reading and Transformation support, and school ELL supports will provide interventions during and after school. Students' baseline and STAR data will be utilized to support implemented interventions. Students' weekly assessment data will be monitored by teachers, administration and support teams to support small group and pull out instruction. Weekly, district, and F.A.S.T. data will be monitored for student academic progression. Data chats will be held between teachers and students to establish goals based on students' performance levels.

The Guidance Counselor will closely monitor daily attendance and follow district attendance guidelines for interventions for students who are habitually tardy or absent. Guidance counselors and teachers will meet weekly to exchange information on students identified through classroom progress monitoring as Tier 3 and guide them through the documented process of MTSS. Information gathered during the weekly meetings will be reported to the administrative team weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sonja Lewis (lewissonja@gcpsmail.com)

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.)

Implemented progress monitoring in conjunction with the use of the Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports and implemented strategic interventions that speak to academic or behavioral needs of the student will be the primary evidence-based strategies. Facilitated training with teachers and staff will be conducted to ensure appropriate identification and effective implementation of the MTSS for timely and relevant recommendations for students. Teachers, the instructional Reading coach, the Guidance Counselor, and administration will collaboratively implement the process with district support using student data to determine the next action steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using the MTSS Framework is because it is an evidence-based model that focuses on the whole child. MTSS first addresses Tier 1 instruction and uses the data to implement specific interventions based on individual student needs. The MTSS also addresses other relevant areas of focus to include attendance, behavior and social and emotional needs which directly impact a student's academic growth.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Action steps that will be taken are to administer baseline assessments and weekly assessments to collect data to be used in data chats with administration, teachers, students and MTSS team stakeholders. Continued implementation of weekly PLCs that address weaknesses or areas of improvement targeting the building of teacher capacity and student need. Continuous monitoring of weekly and progress monitoring data to make informed decisions about subgroups and interventions needed to supplement academic progress in ELA and Math.

Individual and collaborative team meetings will include ESE Resource teachers and ELL supports that focus on MTSS strategies and the incorporation of developing pull out/push in schedules. These schedules will support students in whole group instruction and focus on specific targeted areas in small groups. Classroom walk-throughs to ensure standard-based instruction and effective instructional strategies are being implemented in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Sonja Lewis (lewissonja@gcpsmail.com)

By When:

#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.

George W. Munroe will continue to focus on increasing student achievement across the grade levels and in ELA and Math. Implementing standard-based instruction to provide students at the earliest grade levels with foundational skills to support the academic progress of students being prepared by third grade to read to learn in all academic subject areas.

To achieve this goal, teachers will consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively plan standards-based lessons that are engaging and meet the needs of various learners. Strong collaboration within and among grade levels will assist with increased accountability, intentional planning and improved instructional momentum. Strategically planned and facilitated PLCs will provide opportunities for success by maximizing our instructional strengths, strengthening our instructional areas of opportunities and improving the academic forward progress of students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome for this area of focus will include a 95% attendance rate for administration, teachers, resource teachers and support staff for weekly scheduled Professional Learning Communities. Based on the 2022-2023 school data, ELA will increase from students performing at a 23% level 3 or higher proficiency to students performing at a 35% level 3 or higher proficiency (+12). In Math, we will increase from 45% to 55% (+10) of students performing at a level 3 or higher proficiency. There will be learning gains of at least 50% in ELA and Math for students retained in third grade.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by school administrators, reading coach and the district support team to include Professional Learning. The administration will also collaborate with the State Regional Literacy Director and PAEC for Math Support. The collaborative team will use classroom walkthroughs and provide professional development based on needs observed, student data, and teaching experience. Attendance and teacher feedback will be monitored with sign-in sheets and feedback surveys. Implementation walk-through observations of instructional strategies will also be conducted to provide teachers with timely and relevant feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Weekly Collaborative Planning PLCs with standards aligned learning targets with the end in mind to ensure students are successful on school/state assessments will be a focus.. Teachers and students will continue to develop a way of working focused on reviewing, analyzing, and responding to data to guide forward academic progress.

PLCs designed with teacher and student success will assist teachers in developing strong instructional best practices based on data to inform instructional decisions to guide small groups, differentiation, and enrichment. Planning PLCs include the teachers planning a week in advance to know and understand the standards and set student targets. Meetings will include teacher dialogue, modeling of common student misconceptions, what instructional strategies look and sound like, and how teachers will know a student

has learned the intended target. Student work samples and data will serve as evidence to make adaptations through small groups, remediation, or reteach activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

George W. Munroe students will benefit from Intentional, collaborative planning that addresses what they are to learn, how they will learn it, monitoring of their learning through practice and data, and what will happen if they don't learn it. Research has shown that educational best practices identify the use of small learning communities as one of the most effective methods of promoting and implementing professional learning and introducing new concepts to teachers. George W. Munroe teachers will benefit from PLCs by increasing their content knowledge and teacher capacity while continuing to develop a toolbox of effective best practices, so implementation of instructional strategies and standard-based instruction is seamless.

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.

Administration, teachers, resource support staff and paraprofessionals will participate in PLCs focusing on B.E.S.T. ELA and Math Achievement Level Descriptors, SWOT analysis of instructional and support strategies, and student data analysis.

Action steps will also include the continuation of developing and implementing weekly classroom walkthrough schedules that require administrative feedback. Weekly PLCs will also address Tier 1 instructional implementation, areas of improvement/weaknesses, and student data that will inform/drive school and classroom decisions. Intentional Planning PLCs will include teachers working collaboratively submitting plans one week prior to instruction for administrative review with "before" planning items completed, coming prepared to planning with teacher's edition, weekly assessment, ELA & Math standards and resources if applicable and being prepared to teach a portion of the lesson.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

We are a district that is not able to compete with neighboring salaries, but research has found that teachers would overlook a small difference in salary if they were under instructional leadership that has established a positive culture and environment. Teachers are more apt to remain in a school environment where they are recognized, celebrated, and appreciated for their contributions to student achievement based on common/school-wide beliefs and practices that all stakeholders are vested in. This would impact high or improving attendance rates by staff, improved collaborative relationships, and ultimately increased student achievement. The Mental Health awareness of teachers is an area that we also have to acknowledge so that they feel part of a school family community that will continue to encourage and support them allyear.

Measurable Outcome:

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

George W. Munroe plans to establish an effective New Staff/New Teacher Site-Based Mentoring Program while also maintaining the resiliency of veteran staff and their contribution to the school through participation in Collaborative Planning weekly, Quarterly "Stay" Interviews, and providing targeted incentives for attendance, student growth, and professional growth.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through School Climate Surveys, Monthly Attendance Tracking Data, formal and informal walkthroughs/observations, student discipline reports, "Stay" Interview Collection data, and data from the number of participants receiving recognition/rewards from targeted incentives for attendance, student growth, and professional growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sonja Lewis (lewissonja@gcpsmail.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The National Education Association (NEA) have noted key factors prior to the pandemic, but now those factors have multiplied and led to even more educators old and new feeling exhausted, demoralized, stressed, and overwhelmed. We want to support teachers by providing a positive work environment that fosters collaboration, supportive coaching, timely feedback, and encouraging professional growth. All this will done through a focus on respect, recognition, and reward in order to retain effective employees.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions listed support overall well-being, engagement, and a supportive culture and climate that is key to teacher recruitment and retention which leads to stability and growth for the school, teachers, and students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

Each week faculty and staff will receive recognition in the school "Pirate Weekly" that highlights attendance, collaboration efforts, or any other "GameChanging" behavior. Category 1 teachers will be assigned a mentor and teacher buddy with monthly check-in activities. Monthly celebrations of birthdays, data, and attendance will be provided in an effort to show they are valued. Collegial Walks to Learn will be implemented to aide in professional growth and support. School-wide rewards and incentives will be in place to contribute to the overall belonging to an organization that fully supports staff well-being.

Person Responsible: Sonja Lewis (lewissonja@gcpsmail.com)

By When: By June 2024, at least 80% of staff will complete climate survey that provides evidence that they feel supported in/outside of classroom, appreciated as an active participant in personal and student growth, and valued as an educator.

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).

George W. Munroe along with guidance of district leaders will review and commit to monitoring and the adherence of protocols to ensure strategies and implementation is based on needs supported by data analysis. This information will be collected, published, and discussed at school board meeting among school and community stakeholders.

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 Area of Focus for the school is Instructional Practice Specifically relating to Benchmark Aligned Instruction in Reading/ELA so teachers are equipped to implement effective instruction and build a

strong foundation at the earliest levels, so by 3rd grade they are not learning to read but reading to learn at a deeper level. The need for this Area of Focus derives from 2023 FAST data that shows that 71% of our 3rd graders were below proficiency. Rising/Upcoming K-3rd grade students 2022-23 STAR progress monitoring shows the following: 3rd grade(72%), 2nd grade(67%), 1st grade(41%), Kindergarten(58%) are not on track to score Level 3 and above a state standardized assessment. The 2022-23 STAR data also reveals that KG, 2nd, and 3rd grade have less 50% on track to score at or above Level 3.

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

The Area of Focus for the school is Instructional Practice Specifically relating to Benchmark Aligned Instruction in Reading/ELA so teachers are equipped to implement effective instruction and build a strong foundation at the earliest levels, so by 3rd grade they are not learning to read but reading to learn at a deeper level. The need for this Area of Focus derives from 2023 FAST data that shows that 71% of our 3rd graders were below proficiency.

The current 3rd grade students Spring 2022-23 STAR progress monitoring shows that 72% are entering below proficiency.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, the FAST progress monitoring data will show that students in Kindergarten will increase from 42% to 52%, students in 1st grade will increase from 59% to 64%, and 2nd grade will increase from 33% to 50% or more to be on track to score at or above Level 3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, Grade 3 students will increase the number of students scoring Level 3 or above from the previous year by increasing the percentage from 23% to 34%.

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.

Monitoring for desired outcomes will be achieved through classroom walkthroughs, focused data meetings, school progress monitoring of weekly, monthly, and quarterly school and district assessments. Through Professional Learning Communities, teachers and administrators will focus on standards-based instruction, planning, monitoring of student progress, and developing strategies that will impact student success overall.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kirkland, Germaine, browng@gcpsmail.com

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?

KPALS is a program that focuses on phonemic awareness, letter-sound recognition, sight word reading, and decoding, it is a great beginning for students to gain a basic fundamental foundation for reading.

Corrective Reading and Phonics for Reading are programs for upper elementary struggling readers that uses scripted, structured lessons focused on phonics, fluency, and comprehension.

Magnetic Reading is a comprehensive foundational skills program that delivers explicit, systematic foundational skills instruction in grades K-2.

Evidence-based practices used will be providing interventions through small groups and/or one on one from support staff, ESE resource staff, and ESOL support.

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?

Yes, the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need as indicated through multiple data points K-3rd. Both programs have a strong ESSA rating with KPALS with a +0.23 effect size and Corrective Reading with a +0.06 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|--|
| <p>Establish a culture of effective planning:</p> <p>-Literacy Leadership: a team comprised of reading endorsed teachers will model and present best practices in grade level team meetings, in professional learning communities, and at school events.</p> <p>-Literacy Coaching: The Reading Coach will observe new and fragile teachers and take them through the coaching cycle to improve their classroom instruction</p> <p>-Assessment: It will be monitored by administration, teachers, and school-wide so that we can address weakness and develop a plan for remediation, intervention, and/or enrichment</p> <p>-Professional Learning- Trainings will be provided by the district reading support along with, trainings for the core implementation</p> | <p>Kirkland, Germaine, browng@gcpsmail.com</p> |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

George W. Munroe Elementary will use various methods to increase transparency in communication with all stakeholders. We will utilize the following methods: email, school website, school newsletter, school events virtual or face to face, school advisory council meetings, school leadership and grade level meetings, Quarterly Parent Expos. Since we serve a population of Hispanic students, every effort is made to share information in written form in their native language as well as secure a translator when applicable.

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))

George W. Munroe will 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 through written communication via flyers, letters, social media, mid progress reports, end of 9 weeks report cards, school events on campus, school advisory council meetings, encouraging parent volunteers on campus, and sharing important dates and events via email, telephone, or Skylert.

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))

George W. Munroe will plan for bell to bell instruction and a strict adherence to following the Master Schedule. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning and monthly professional development to support teacher growth and student needs. There will be mandatory uninterrupted instructional time so teachers can focus on teaching and students learning. As a school we will provide small group instruction that addresses differentiation of students who are fragile learners and those that will benefit from enrichment and acceleration. All efforts will be supported by the administrative team, Reading Coach, and interventionists.

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))

George W. Munroe will ensure all programs used are state evidence-based programs for core and interventions. Our school ensures that all students with disabilities and English Language Learners are allowed the required accommodations in the classroom and on state assessments. We also will continue to prepare and train highly qualified teachers who support the school vision and mission in increasing student achievement.

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))

George W. Munroe's Guidance Counselor, site Social Worker, ESE Resource Teachers, district ESE department as well as the district Headstart/PreK Mental Health program work closely together to be able to provide the necessary services to students and their families. Our students also attend Character Education at least once a week where we focus on being a good Pirate citizen along with other SEL activities.

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))

Our students are at a very impressionable age, so we host a career day fair at the school. Students get an opportunity to be able to interact with local professionals in the community that introduce them to careers they may or may not be familiar with. Career Day gives our young students an opportunity to explore various career options such as dentist, nursing, law enforcement, etc.

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).

We will continue to follow our MTSS protocols facilitated by our Guidance Counselor and Social Worker for students who are facing challenges with behavior which include individual and/or group counseling sessions. This year we will use a PBIS system where students are allowed to earn Pirate bucks to shop at the Pirate store as an incentive and reinforcement for positive behavior.

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))

Teachers will participate in weekly Professional Learning Communities that focus on Standards Based Planning, Standards Based Instruction, Conditions for Learning, and Professional Responsibilities in an effort to build capacity and teacher content knowledge. Teachers will also participate in professional learning opportunities offered through PAEC, the district, and all other trainings directly related to supporting our school goals.

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))

Several local daycares/learning centers have students enrolled in their preschool program. As Principal, we share readiness checkpoints and milestones that will help with the smooth transition into our elementary school program.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged | | | | \$148,395.00 |
|----------|--------|--|----------------|-------|-------------|--------------|
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 | |
| 5100 | 391 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$22,100.00 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Contracted services less than \$25,000. Contracted services to provide individual or small group instructional support to targeted students who have demonstrated deficiencies in Reading. services provided by retired educator(25 weeks, 10hrs/wk @ \$35/hr)</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | | 492.0 | \$6,000.00 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Incentives and recognition for student attendance and behavior with rewards such as pencils, poppets, spirit shirts, stickers, bracelets, skittles, lollipops, gaming trucks, etc.</i> | | | | |
| 5100 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$45,000.00 | |
| | | <i>Notes: Beyond the school day tutoring first semester (3) teachers for 3 days a week and second semester (8) teachers for 3 days a week. One afterschool coordinator @ \$40/hr and teachers @ \$35/hr.</i> | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|---|----------------|-------|--------------------|
| | 7800 | 330 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$29,300.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Transportation for students participating in Beyond the School day program(3 days a week)</i> | | | |
| | 7800 | 160 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$30,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Offsite and onsite field trips that are aligned with standards-based instruction, culturally relevant as well as provide incentives to students for attendance, behavior, and student achievement. The field trips planned for the scholars include onsite puppet show, virtual fieldtrips, Jacksonville Zoo, Redemptive Farms, LegoLand, Universal Studios, Busch Gardens as are aligned with Florida standards and adopted curricular materials.</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$6,995.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials and supplies to promote parent engagement in school-sponsored events, trainings and activities. Materials will include pencils, paper, makers, parent literature, manipulatives for at-home learning activities in ELA, math, science; sensory tools; educational games. Parents will attend 4 parent nights throughout the year for information on B.E.S.T standards, understanding student data and grade level requirements, progress monitoring, and make and take nights to promote learning at home and school.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | | 492.0 | \$7,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: PBIS store items to purchase with Pirate Bucks. Pirate bucks earned by eligible students for behavior, attendance challenge rewards, accelerated reader points, and progress monitoring achievement.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Student spirit t-shirts to promote safety</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | | | | \$77,355.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 6400 | 130 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$15,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary. Math Specialist to support teachers and students B.E.S.T Math Standards implementation through onsite and virtual support, modeling, coaching, data analysis</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 210 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$1,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Benefits. Retirement for Math Specialist</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$1,147.50 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Benefits. FICA for Math Specialist.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 230 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$1,250.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Benefits. Group Insurance for Math Specialist.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 240 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$217.50 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Benefits. Workers Comp for Math Specialist.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 120 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$15,000.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|--|----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Reading Coaches, teachers of ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies will be compensated two days a week(one hour each day), Monday-Thursday to plan for weekly standards-based instruction and intervention at \$35/hr.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 330 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Model School Conference Registration for participants(10)</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 330 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$10,640.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Travel. Model School Conference: \$356(car rental and per diem) = hotel accommodations: \$200/night x3 nightsx10 participants+\$6000+meals: \$36/day x 3 daysx10 participants=\$1080</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 120 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$12,600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional staff K-3 will spend a week during the summer prior to return for new school year developing curriculum, planning, and preparing student lessons/activities for whole an small group for all learners (Tier 1, 2, & 3). Teachers compensated for 4 days, \$35/hr, 15 teachers and reading coach.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$5,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials and supplies to support professional development to include paper, pens, planner, notebooks, math manipulatives, Elkonian box mats, highlighters, chart paper</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 330 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | | | \$5,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Travel for costs involved in attending trainings or conferences to include meals, hotels, registration fees and other expenditures associated with traveling on district business</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | | | | \$14,600.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 6400 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | UniSIG | 492.0 | \$7,600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Professional development to include training in core curriculum and team building activities to boost moral and foster collaboration. Purchase positive promotion items such as tumblers, lunch bags, notepads, pens, care packages/baskets, and other miscellaneous items needed for activities.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0041 - George W. Munroe Elem. School | | | \$7,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Staff Appreciation Week (yard signs, personal wellness items/activities, positive memorabilia that show appreciation)</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$240,350.00 |

Budget Approval

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

No