Deaf Elementary School (Fsdb)

2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deaf Elementary School (Fsdb)

207 SAN MARCO AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Donald Curran

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2018

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Unsatisfactory 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FSDB County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind is to utilize all available talent, energy, and resources to provide free appropriate public education for eligible sensory-impaired students of Florida. As a school of academic excellence, the school shall strive to provide students an opportunity to access education services in a caring, safe, unique learning environment to prepare them to be literate, employable, and independent lifelong learners. The school shall provide outreach services that include collaboration with district school boards and shall encourage input from students, staff, parents, and the community. As a diverse organization, the school shall foster respect and understanding for each individual. (Florida Statute 1002.36)

Provide the school's vision statement.

FSDB will prepare each student for a lifetime of success.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The Deaf Elementary serves students in Kindergarten through Fifth grade. All of the students have Individualized Education Plans and have been identified as Deaf/Hard of Hearing in the state of Florida. We provide instruction in American Sign Language in order to build the language skills necessary to be successful in life. In addition, we provide small class sizes and direct instruction to give students the academic foundation to succeed in their educational career.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, 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
Waldbillig, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal responsible for monitoring the instructional program at Deaf Elementary School
Traetto, Cally	Reading Coach	Literacy Specialist responsible for coaching, data collection, PLCs and working with teachers to support evidenced based literacy practices in the school.
Binder, Andrea	Math Coach	Works with staff on implementation of the math curriculum aligned with the BEST standards. Is responsible for data, PLCs, instructional coaching of staff.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

FSDB provides all of the instruction for the students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/13/2018, Donald Curran

Total number of students enrolled at the school.
58

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.
15

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?
14

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?
1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?
14

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	7	8	4	21	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/19/2022

2021-22 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	6	4	13	14	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	9	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		5%	56%						57%
ELA Learning Gains									58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									53%
Math Achievement			50%						63%
Math Learning Gains									62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									51%
Science Achievement			59%						53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	11%	8%	3%	58%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	10%	-10%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2022					
	2019	9%	7%	2%	56%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	33%	25%	8%	62%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	5%	-5%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2022					
	2019	5%	3%	2%	60%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	6%	4%	2%	53%	-47%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	5	20			11						
WHT	5	33									
FRL		6			11						
2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	7	26		39	39		11				
HSP				30							
WHT	11	42		42	58						
FRL	5	20		39	20						
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	7	15		24	31		23				
WHT	8	4		19	29		15				
FRL	3	15		21	37		24				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	7
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	36
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	7
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	8
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	3
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

The Deaf Elementary School used data from the MAP- Measures of Academic Progress testing in order to monitor students three times a year. Students conferenced with teachers on their data and information was placed in student data portfolios.

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

Deaf Elementary has shown growth in the areas of reading and language. Students are reviewed on our Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Teams when there are struggles in any of the academic areas. Interventions are discussed and put into place to support student growth. Instruction takes place in

American Sign Language. This year, FSDB also implemented a literacy plan in which literacy instruction is monitored and weekly opportunities for literacy Professional Development is provided.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Although the Reading and Language improved, this continues to be an area in which the school focus continues to be. Students have showed gaps and delays in language skills as well as being identified as children with Deafness or Hard of Hearing. This impacts learning in this area. Literacy Walk throughs, professional development and additional supports of the American Sign Language Specialist will be implemented to support continued growth.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In Deaf Elementary, we often see students who come to the school with significant language deprivation due to the inability to access language in their homes. With all of the students being served under an Individualized Education Plan, we see that students are functioning below the levels expected for their age and grade levels. Students require intensive supports and direct instruction in the core content areas, specifically in language and reading due to the impact of Deafness in these areas.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Currently, students are placed into small groups and small class sizes (Average 4-6 students in each class) with support to allow students to receive direct instruction. Students are monitored on the MTSS team and specialists work with teachers on strategies to support student learning. Frequent data chats are done with teachers, specialists and with students, using a data notebook to show student growth. IEP goals are written specifically to address the needs and the gaps of each student individually.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers are provided with weekly opportunities to attend professional development in the area of literacy. The math specialist will provide support to teachers and leaders on the new benchmarks and strategies needed to maximize student learning.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Currently 82% of students in Deaf Elementary earned a level one on state testing. However, using MAP data, we have seen that 90% of the students in DES have made any growth in reading and 95% in Language Arts throughout the year. However, overall projected growth needs to be addressed. In reading, 32% of students met their projected growth over the past year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	According to map data, 37% of our students will meet their projected growth in the area of reading.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Students will participate in the MAP assessment three times a year- Fall, MidYear, and Spring. After each assessment, data will be gathered to review progress of students and classes. Reading specialists will perform data chats with teachers to identify gaps and areas that can be improved within instruction to support student growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cally Traetto (traetto@fsdbk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment is an evidenced-based assessment that is aligned to the standards. Using data chats and Professional Learning Communities is an evidence-based practice to support instructional staff. Students are placed into small class sizes in order to assist in direct instruction in the area of reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The MAP is a consistent measure of student progress.

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.	
Students will participate in MAP assessment 3 times a year	
Person Responsible	Jessica Waldbillig (waldbilligj@fsdbk12.org)
Data will be gathered by reading specialists to be dissagregated.	
Person Responsible	Cally Traetto (traetto@fsdbk12.org)
Teachers will participate in data chats with students, using data portfolios to allow students to be active participants in understanding their data and growth.	
Person Responsible	Jessica Waldbillig (waldbilligj@fsdbk12.org)
Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups	Data will be disaggregated by subgroup to ensure growth and progress.

not meeting the 41% threshold according
to the Federal Index.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on the previous year's math data, 95% of students in Deaf Elementary School demonstrated growth. DES would like to see this continue consistently. In the 22-23 school year, new math curriculum and standards are being rolled out in the school. Because of the newness of the implementation of the standards and materials, math progress and fidelity of instruction will be monitored to maintain student growth.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	All math teachers will participate in monthly PLCs to review pacing guides, evidenced-based strategies for teaching math, data, and implementation of the curriculum.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The MAP assessment will be given to students three times a year. Data will be monitored to measure growth and areas of need.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Math Specialists will work with all of the teachers in implementing the B.E.S.T. standards and the new curricular materials with fidelity. The MAP assessment shows student areas of growth and need. PLCs will occur with the specialists to look at data and determine areas that can be improved within instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The MAP assessment is an evidenced-based strategy to accurately measure student areas of growth and need. Assessing the data frequently is an important part of assessing where the school can improve instruction to students in math

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.	
Map Assessments will occur three times a year	
Person Responsible	Jessica Waldbillig (waldbilligj@fsdbk12.org)
specialists will work with teachers to assess data and implement the curriculum with fidelity and to review the pacing guides.	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Teachers will participate in Data chats with their students frequently using data notebooks.	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Monitoring ESSA Impact:	
If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	Data will be disaggregated by subgroup to ensure growth and progress.

#3. Other specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Student social-emotional development is a critical component of academic readiness. Currently systems are being explored to provide direct instruction to students using character education and the implementation of Zones of Regulation

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

Students who require social-emotional support will be reviewed on the MTSS team. Monitoring will occur on the success of students to identify their emotions using the Zones, researched-based program. Student data will be reviewed to monitor if use of common language to identify their emotions has a positive impact on behavior occurrences in the classroom/school.

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

MTSS progress notes will be used to review individual student data. School wide data will be reviewed monthly for trends and needs to observe if the common language is being used and the impact on behavior as a whole.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Waldbillig (waldbilligj@fsdbk12.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Zones of Regulation is an evidenced based strategy that gives language to identify different "zones" of feelings that interfere with learning. Providing students with the language and release options allows them to learn to self-regulate across environments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

A program was needed to provide a consistent language and modality of instruction for students in the school.

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

Monitoring ESSA Impact:
If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Data will be disaggregated by subgroup to ensure growth and progress.

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

28% met projected growth goals based on national norms. K-2 will use the Fingerspelling Our Way to Reading instructional materials as a supplement to the core, adopted curriculum materials. This is an evidence-based practice for students who are Deaf/hard of hearing. This program is a systematic, explicit instructional program to allow students to participate in word analysis, phonological awareness, and orthographic mapping. Students scored the lowest in the foundational skills categories of the data.

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

In grades 3-5, 33% of students met projected growth goals based on national norms. Teachers in 3-5 will utilize the core, instructional materials, MyView, utilizing principles of explicit instruction. MyView is an evidence-based practice that provides high-quality tier 1 instruction.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2021-2022, 0% of kindergarten students, 50% of 1st grade students, and 33% of 2nd grade students met their projected growth on the NWEA MAP Reading assessment. By the end of the 2022-2023 School year, 33% of kindergarten students, 55% of 1st grade students, and 38% of 2nd grade students will meet their projected growth the NWEA MAP Reading assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2021-2022, 36% of 3rd Grade students, 33% of 4th grade students, and 32% of 5th grade students scored in the 50th percentile on the NWEA MAP Reading assessment. By the end of the 2022-2023

School year, 41% of 3rd Grade students, 38% of 4th grade students, and 37% of 5th grade students will s

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

This goal will be monitored quarterly by the Literacy Leadership Team. Lesson Plans will be monitored by the Assistant Principal and weekly Literacy walk-throughs will be conducted by the Assistant Principal. Literacy Coaching schedules will be monitored by the Executive Director of Curriculum and Professional Development. The Principal will meet directly with Assistant Principal to address any concerns regarding implementation and if needs of students are not being met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Waldbillig, Jessica, waldbilligj@fsdbk12.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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?

1. Fingerspelling Our Way to Reading is an evidence-based program studied specifically on students who are Deaf/hard of hearing.

2. MyView is an evidence-based program with promising levels of evidence. It is the core curriculum identified in the K-12 Reading plan and aligns with the B.E.S.T. standards. (Evidence Explained: https://assets.savvas.com/asset_mgr/current/202038/Grants- myView-Evidence-Flyer.pdf?_ga=2.266549000.789985080.1628879529-96749450.1628879529)

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

1. Fingerspelling Our Way to Reading is an evidence-based program studied specifically on students who are Deaf/hard of hearing.

2. MyView is an evidence-based program with promising levels of evidence. It is the core curriculum identified in the K-12 Reading plan and aligns with the B.E.S.T. standards. (Evidence Explained: https://assets.savvas.com/asset_mgr/current/202038/Grants- myView-Evidence-Flyer.pdf?_ga=2.266549000.789985080.1628879529-96749450.1628879529)

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
i. Literacy Leadership: Administration will engage in learning about explicit instruction and Fingerspelling our Way to Reading. ii. Literacy Coaching: The literacy coach will support implementation of Fingerspelling our way to reading iii. Assessment: will be assessed Bi-Weekly, weekly My view Progress Check-ups and MAP assessments iv. Professional Learning: New teachers will be trained. All teachers will engage in monthly PLCs. i. Literacy Leadership: Literacy Leadership Teams will discuss the implementation, assessments, and student data ii. Literacy Coaching: The Literacy Coach will engage in coaching cycles, modeling, conferring, and professional learning with teachers iii. Assessment: K-2 Students will be assessed Bi-Weekly Assessments, weekly My view Progress Check-ups. MAP assessments will occur 3 times a year. iv. Professional Learning: Teachers will participate in monthly PLCs to analyze data. Data analysis will guide next steps. The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support team will engage in data chats after each progress monitoring cycle.	Waldbillig, Jessica, waldbilligj@fsdbk12.org

Positive Culture & Environment
A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.
PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

PBIS used in the classroom will support a decrease in discipline referrals and behavioral disruptions that may be demonstrated in the class. Monthly meetings will take place to review discipline trends to see if there are strategies that could be implemented in specific locations or with specific individuals who have repeated behaviors. These will be discussed in the meetings and during MTSS and PBIS team meetings to develop strategies to support staff and students.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Monthly information will be provided through the Behavior Occurrence Reporting Team and through the Multi-Tiered System of Supports Process.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Data collected on discipline events will be monitored on a weekly basis by the Assistant Principal and by the Review team monthly.

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 Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
PBIS team will meet on a monthly basis to review areas to support positive behavior and growth in the schools- The BORT (Behavior Occurance Reporting Team) team will review data trends	Milczarski, Alesia, milczarskia@fsdbk12.org