

Okaloosa County School District

# Annette P. Edwins Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Annette P. Edwins Elementary School

7 WRIGHT PKWY SW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Kathleen Armstrong**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 80%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: B (60%)<br>2016-17: A (67%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Annette P. Edwins Elementary School

7 WRIGHT PKWY SW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 68%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 52%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | B       | B       | B       |

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

We prepare all students to achieve excellence by providing the highest quality education while empowering each individual to positively impact their families, communities, and the world.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Edwins Mission Statement: At Edwins we strive to provide rigorous learning opportunities that result in significant academic gains within an environment of love and trust.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name               | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Armstrong, K       | Principal           | As principal I am responsible for all aspects of school operations. This includes ensuring standards are being taught and assessed with fidelity, small group instruction is being applied to meet the needs of every student and that resources are being used to achieve school goals. I am also responsible for the safety of all students and staff, the maintenance of the facility, funding for projects and accountability for district and state mandates. I am focused primarily on the ELA department although I oversee all faculty and staff. |
| Waskow, LuCretia   | Assistant Principal | Responsible to supervise math department including teachers and curriculum. Manages student discipline, scheduling and daily operations.  |
| Jackson, Kayla     | School Counselor    | Responsible to organize and manage MTSS system, ESE referrals and social emotional learning program.  |
| Harvey, Kimberly   | Teacher, K-12       | Grade level chair for 4th/5th grade ELA team.   |
| Richey, Robin      | Teacher, K-12       | 4th & 5th grade math chair  |
| Rounsaville, Renee | Instructional Coach | Guide ELA department in professional development with direct instruction and imbedded coaching.   |
| Sadler, Chris      | Instructional Coach | Guides math teachers in professional develop which includes direct instruction and imbedded coaching.   |
| Snyder, April      | Teacher, K-12       | Leads the 3rd grade ELA/Math team.  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Kathleen Armstrong

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

24

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33



**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

442

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

18

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

22

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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                              | 66          | 78 | 78 | 65 | 71 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 423   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 5           | 13 | 18 | 6  | 11 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 4  | 1  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 6           | 16 | 5  | 4  | 9  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 5           | 12 | 5  | 4  | 7  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 12 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| 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 | 6           | 14 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |

**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     | 6           | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| 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**

Thursday 9/23/2021

**2020-21 - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                                     | Grade Level | Total |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled                   |             |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   |             |       |
| One or more suspensions                       |             |       |
| Course failure in ELA                         |             |       |
| Course failure in Math                        |             |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  |             |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment |             |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |       |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year     |             |       |
| Students retained two or more times |             |       |

**2020-21 - 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                   | 84          | 81 | 74 | 65 | 66 | 55 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 425 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 16          | 22 | 11 | 12 | 6  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72  |       |
| One or more suspensions                       | 8           | 1  | 3  | 2  | 1  | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                         | 20          | 9  | 5  | 5  | 14 | 7  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60  |       |
| Course failure in Math                        | 16          | 9  | 7  | 8  | 10 | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 17 | 24 | 21 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9  | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55  |       |

**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 | 19          | 9 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 68    |

**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     | 5           | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| 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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 49%    | 67%      | 57%   | 52%    | 65%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 50%    | 64%      | 58%   | 55%    | 58%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 57%    | 57%      | 53%   | 64%    | 52%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 59%    | 73%      | 63%   | 61%    | 72%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 67%    | 70%      | 62%   | 76%    | 62%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 63%    | 60%      | 51%   | 74%    | 53%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 51%    | 62%      | 53%   | 38%    | 66%      | 55%   |

### 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 |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 66%      | -22%                       | 58%   | -14%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 43%    | 67%      | -24%                       | 58%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -44%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 67%      | -12%                       | 56%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -43%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 42%    | 73%      | -31%                       | 62%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 74%      | -14%                       | 64%   | -4%                     |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -42%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 71%      | -2%                        | 60%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -60%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 63%      | -13%                       | 53%   | -3%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

iReady is used to progress monitor all students in grade K-5.  
5th grade science data comes from FCAT

| Grade 1               |                            |        |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 81/23% | 79/30% | 79/54% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 55/20% | 53/23% | 59/49% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 20/25% | 19/32% | 19/58% |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 8/0%   | 6/0%   | 7/0%   |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 81/10% | 77/23% | 79/53% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 55/7%  | 51/16% | 59/49% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 20/15% | 19/37% | 19/58% |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 8/0%   | 6/0%   | 7/14%  |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |

| Grade 2                  |                               |        |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 73/27% | 71/52% | 70/61% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 52/27% | 49/59% | 54/61% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 17/29% | 16/44% | 17/65% |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 10/20% | 11/45% | 11/55% |
|                          |                               |        |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 73/18% | 72/38% | 70/70% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 52/15% | 50/46% | 54/70% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 17/24% | 17/41% | 17/82% |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 10/20% | 11/27% | 11/45% |
|                          |                               |        |        |        |
| Grade 3                  |                               |        |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 62/48% | 63/51% | 62/65% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 40/50% | 38/50% | 39/72% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 18/22% | 17/24% | 17/24% |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 10/20% | 10/20% | 9/33%  |
|                          |                               |        |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 62/13% | 63/35% | 63/62% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 40/10% | 38/29% | 40/58% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 18/0%  | 17/12% | 18/22% |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 11/0%  | 10/50% | 9/78%  |
|                          |                               |        |        |        |

| Grade 4               |                            |        |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 66/21% | 64/36% | 65/46% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 41/24% | 37/35% | 41/44% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22/18% | 21/19% | 21/19% |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 3/0%   | 3/33%  | 3/33%  |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 65/14% | 65/38% | 65/67% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 40/13% | 38/37% | 40/70% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22/9%  | 21/24% | 21/29% |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 3/33%  | 3/33%  | 3/100% |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
| Grade 5               |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 56/23% | 53/32% | 55/36% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 33/21% | 31/19% | 34/29% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22/18% | 22/9%  | 25/8%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 4/0%   | 4/0%   | 4/0%   |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 56/14% | 52/25% | 55/47% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 33/15% | 30/23% | 34/41% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22/9%  | 22/9%  | 25/20% |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 4/0%   | 4/0%   | 4/25%  |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               |        |        | 53/25% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |        |        | 33/21% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |        |        | 24/13% |
|                       | English Language Learners  |        |        | 4/0%   |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 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                                       | 18       | 24     |             | 23        | 24      |              | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       |        |             | 47        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 10     |             | 27        | 20      |              | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 39       |        |             | 43        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       |        |             | 72        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 40       | 39     |             | 47        | 39      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 21     |             | 40        | 25      |              | 22       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 28       | 35     | 53          | 42        | 57      | 63           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 46       | 47     |             | 54        | 35      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 43       | 60     |             | 62        | 72      |              | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 47       | 39     |             | 59        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 45       | 30     |             | 60        | 70      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 54     | 53          | 57        | 68      | 67           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 45     | 58          | 58        | 64      | 59           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 27       | 57     | 65          | 41        | 68      | 73           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 75     |             | 52        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 46       | 45     |             | 60        | 65      |              | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 53       | 74     |             | 69        | 84      |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 48       | 67     |             | 52        | 87      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 57       | 53     | 62          | 60        | 75      | 73           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 51       | 60     | 63          | 55        | 71      | 68           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 35  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 6   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 26  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 209 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 6   |
| Percent Tested   | 98% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 21  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 35  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| 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%        |     |
| 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%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 21  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 32  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 61  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |



| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| 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%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 40  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 30  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

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

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

Our science scores are low each year and specifically our students with disabilities struggle in this area. Our students typically start the year with low proficiency but we are able to move most students by the end of the year. We are often statistically below our district and our state in reading and math proficiency.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our 5th grade ELA did not make the same level of gains as was seen in all other grade levels. This is true across all subgroups .

A second area of concern is the lack of proficiency and gains for our ESE students in 3-5 ELA and Math.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Last year the 5th grade team used a departmentalized model with some students being taught online. All of the students at brick and mortar school were taught by a single section. This section experienced turn over and was taught at some point by a long term sub.

Our concerns with ESE stem from multiple self-contained CBS classrooms with multiple grade levels in each.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Both ELA and Math showed impressive gains overall in grades K-4.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Edwins implemented iReady school-wide last year. This program allows for individualized skill building with teacher follow through and remediation.

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

Small group instruction is essential to accelerate learning. Our most deficient students need time engaged in instructional activities at their level to address specific skill gaps. Para professionals and remediation teachers are being deployed at every grade level to support small group instruction.

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

ELA & Math teachers work with instructional coaches. Coaches are imbedded in the planning process for whole and small group instruction. ELA and math teachers engage in weekly PD sessions with the coaches. We have a new reading series and the ELA coach is instrumental in rolling out this new resource.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Teachers have been grouped into teams so that no one teacher is an island and the teams all have shared planning time. We are investing in our teachers so that next year we will have less turn-over and all the training we have done will stay here at Edwins. We are keeping small group tracking logs that are used for MTSS and to help teachers plan for small group lessons with fidelity.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 5th grade ELA scores were significantly lower than district and state averages. We have new teachers and a new looping system to keep students with their teachers two years in a row.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The 1st administration of iReady reports that 5th grade ELA are 21% proficient. Our goal is that at the 3rd administration students will be at at 55% proficient.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | We will monitor it via the iReady progress monitoring tool. Assessments are administered 3 times a year.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Small group instruction based on student area of deficit. This information will come from iReady reports. Fidelity to small groups will be monitored with a small group tracking tool. This will be a planning, reevaluating, and revising tool that can also be used for MTSS fidelity tracking.. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | iReady is an evidence-based program.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Train teachers on use of iReady.

**Person Responsible** Renee Rounsaville (renee.rounsaville@okaloosaschools.com)

Monitor small group tracking sheets for fidelity.

**Person Responsible** K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

Walk through classrooms regularly during small group instruction to observe.

**Person Responsible** K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

Train teachers on balanced literacy model and new Benchmark Advanced reading series.

**Person Responsible** Renee Rounsaville (renee.rounsaville@okaloosaschools.com)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

At our 3rd progress monitoring last year, our ESE students scored significantly less proficient than their non-disabled peers. They also showed lower gains.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our 3-5 students with disabilities will be at least 45% proficient in reading and in math as measured by the 3rd administration of iReady.

**Monitoring:** It will be measured by the 3rd administration of iReady.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Small group intervention with skill deficit data provided by iReady will be implemented at all levels. Additionally staff members will all be trained in Social Emotional Learning to help students regulate their behavior and lose less academic time. Teachers will also be trained to provide evidence-based accommodations to all ESE students during instruction and assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

iReady is an evidence based program when used as tool with fidelity. We have three CBS classes in which behavior can be a hurdle to quality instruction. Using SEL in all rooms will help improve instructional time.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide iReady training to all teachers. - OCSd district personnel and instructional coach

**Person Responsible**

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

Train teachers on ESE accommodations - ESE chair, staffing specialist

**Person Responsible**

LuCretia Waskow (lucetia.waskow@okaloosaschools.com)

Require teachers to document ESE accommodations - Admin

**Person Responsible**

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

Require teachers to document ESE accommodations - Admin

**Person Responsible**

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**Suspensions both in school and out were at a much higher proportion than data across the state. We have been on an upward trend over the last few years. We redeployed our PBIS program this year and provided teachers with time, training and material for social emotional learning to improve self regulation.**

#### **Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

#### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Edwins is a PBIS school. All teachers are trained and provided materials to develop classroom cultures based on recognition of positive behaviors that lead to productive learning environments. As a school we support this by celebrating individual and group rewards, supporting the Viking school store where students can spend the Viking Bucks they earn during the month. We also have weekly drawings for students who contribute to their classroom goals.

Additionally teachers use a progressive discipline plan with mandatory parent communication and participation. Low levels of intervention are applied across settings to ensure that minor behaviors or behaviors that are a product of trauma are resolved at the lowest level without loss of instruction or self-respect.

Students are encouraged to be reflective of their own behavior and to hold themselves accountable using restorative practices.

#### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Admin - provides financial support, training and materials for PBIS/SEL program.

Teachers- provide core level PBIS scaffold and work through challenging situations with kindness and respect for the child and family.

SAC- parent/community support members provide feedback about systems and provide support to the school via time and expertise.

Community members/Business partners - provide financial support for PBIS programs and partner with school to develop mentorships or real world experiences that show children their community is invested in them and the possibilities of careers in the local area.