

Gadsden County Schools

Greensboro Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	16
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Greensboro Elementary School

559 GREENSBORO HWY, 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.

The mission of the Greensboro Elementary School, is to foster a love of learning in an innovative, cooperative climate using research based programs and educational best practices.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Greensboro Elementary, is to provide students with the skills in Reading , Writing, Math, and Science to make them lifelong learners and successful members of society.

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
Akins, Zola	Assistant Principal	
Bates-Jackson, Erica	Teacher, K-12	
Castenada, Gloria	Teacher, ESE	
Murphy, Sallie	Teacher, K-12	
Pitts, Stephen	Principal	
Weeks, Dawn	Instructional Media	
Joseph, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	

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 recognizes all stakeholders and their importance in building the academic climate and culture of the school. The school strives to build healthy and positive relationships with all stakeholders to include students, teachers, staff, families, and community leaders.

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 monitored quarterly by the administrative and leadership teams. Revisions will be made as deemed necessary.

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	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	5	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	27	
One or more suspensions	2	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	7	7	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	5	6	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	
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		

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	0	0	

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	4	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	18	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	30	36	28	35	0	0	0	0	0	129	

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	3	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	4	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	18	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	30	36	28	35	0	0	0	0	0	129	

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	3	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47	24	53	42	27	56	31		
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	81	37	59	65	36	50	68		
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	62	59	59	77			42		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	237
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	184
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
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				
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	67			
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	58			

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	54			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	62			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	63			

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	47			81								62
SWD												
ELL	19			88							4	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	61			78							3	
HSP	22			83							4	61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	45			78							4	64

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	42			65								77
SWD	27			80								
ELL	33			72								77
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	43			65								
HSP	42			65								79
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	41			69								78

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	31			68								42
SWD												
ELL	36			55								42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17			63								
HSP	45			68								43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33			72								32

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	40%	31%	9%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	75%	45%	30%	59%	16%

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.

Data components indicates that ELA is the area that has the greatest need for improvement. The contributing factors to last year's low performance are attendance, language barriers, limited vocabulary, low economic status, and limited parental support.

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

Data components indicate phonics, fluency and vocabulary are the areas that have the greatest need for improvement in order to increase comprehension levels. The contributing factors to these trends are students' lack of background knowledge and low text exposure.

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.

When compared to the state average, the greatest gap exists with vocabulary and comprehension. This gap exists between all subgroups. The factors that contributed to this gap are lack of background knowledge, low text exposure, limited vocabulary, and language barriers.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was phonics. The new actions that our school implemented was Magnetic Reading for grades K-3 and Phonics for Reading for grades 2-3.

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

Based on the EWS data, our school will focus on attendance and ELA to enhance reading comprehension scores as evidence by STAR, FAST, and PM data.

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

Our top priorities will be fluency, phonics, vocabulary and comprehension for the upcoming school 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.

Our school will focus on increasing student attendance to create a positive culture and environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall goal is to have less than 14 absences per student for the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Our school will proactively monitor student absences and use the social work referral form to document these absences. Currently we have a school social worker on campus three days per week.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zola Akins (outleyz@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.)

An incentive-based "Bulldog Bucks" program will be implemented to encourage student attendance and it will be monitored by the assistant principal, classroom teachers, and school social worker.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are motivated by extrinsic rewards to meet goals for their own attendance, holding them accountable for their dedication to coming to school every day.

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.

An incentive-based "Bulldog Bucks" program will be implemented to encourage student attendance and it will be monitored by the assistant principal, classroom teachers, and school social worker.

Person Responsible: Zola Akins (outleyz@gcpsmail.com)

By When: By the end of school year 2023-24.

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

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

Data indicates that we need to focus on phonics, high-frequency words, fluency and vocabulary to increase comprehension levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students scoring level 3 and above will increase by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

STAR reports will be monitored to determine that adequate progress is being made in Focus area.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zola Akins (outleyz@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.)

HMH, Phonics for Reading, Magnetic Reading and KPALS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

62% of K students achieved at a proficient level on the 2022-2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

31% of 1st grade students achieved at a proficient level on the 2022-2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

23% of 2nd grade students achieved at a proficient level on the 2022-2023 STAR Reading Assessment.

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

41% of 3rd grade students achieved at a level 3 or higher on the 2023 FAST..

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

65% of K students will achieve proficiency on the statewide ELA assessment.

65% of 1st grade students will achieve proficiency on the statewide ELA assessment.

40% of 2nd grade students will achieve proficiency on the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

45% of 3rd grade students will achieve proficiency on the statewide ELA assessment.

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.

Teachers will pull small groups 3-5 times per week for Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Student Goals will be set once baseline progress monitoring assessments are administered. BEST standards-based assessments will be used to monitor students' mastery. Feedback will be provided to students weekly. Data chats between teachers and instructional coach will take place bi-weekly, and new goals will be set for students as they progress. Data chats will be monitored by administration. Specific strategies will be shared with teachers during planning meetings in order to meet the needs of their classroom population. These strategies will be monitored through walkthroughs and observations by coaches and administration.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Akins, Zola, outleyz@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 will be used with Kindergarten, after students are grouped by readiness, allowing for acceleration and remediation at their levels. Kindergarten teachers will have instructional support from Instructional coach and grandparent volunteers..

The Magnetic Reading reading program will be utilized for grades 1&2 for the 2023-2024 school year. This program meets Florida's definition of evidence-based, is aligned with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and is aligned to the BEST Standard. Previous year data will be used to develop groups.

1&2 grade students for tier 3 support.

Phonics for Reading will be used in 3rd grade.

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?

All the aforementioned programs includes a plethora of resources for all tiers of student instruction. Core instruction implemented with fidelity will help to provide students with more small-group instruction to better meet their needs, which is an effective strategy to use with our population. Having the instructional coach provide feedback and assistance with grade level planning will help insure small group instruction better meet their individual needs based on progress monitoring assessments and classroom data. Instructional coaches will help facilitate various instructional strategies such as think-pair-share, formative assessment, text coding, paraphrasing, peer engagement, etc. to enhance the learning environment.

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
GES will have a Literacy Team which will consist of administration, reading coach, and classroom teachers. This team will meet monthly to plan professional development opportunities related to literacy, organize and run the Accelerated Reader program and enlist the assistance of community partners to meet our literacy goals related to the measurable outcomes listed above.	Nelson, Rena, nelsonr@gcpsmail.com
With the guidance of the Literacy Team, professional development opportunities will be conducted that relate directly to progress monitoring data. and data gathered by administration and instructional support teachers during walkthroughs.	Nelson, Rena, nelsonr@gcpsmail.com

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.

The funds will be disseminated through the annual Title I meeting, the school's website and flyers sent home with students.

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))

Our school plans to build positive relationships with all stakeholders by use of the school's web page and hard copies will also be offered in the front office. The school will offer parent nights to provide parents with testing information

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)

Teachers will be provided with a protected 90 minute reading block. School-wide incentive plan in place to increase student attendance and achievement. Positive Behavior supports are in place to foster positive behavior.

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))

District personnel responsible for program implementation collaborate to plan services so that support for students and families are systemic.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No