Okaloosa County School District

Annette P. Edwins Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
	10
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For	or 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.

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

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

Annette P. Edwins Elementary School

7 WRIGHT PKWY SW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Gi (per MSID		2020-21 Title I Schoo	l Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	School	Yes		68%
Primary Servio (per MSID I	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		52%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		В	В	В

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.

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator					Gr	ade	Le	ve	ı					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
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					(3ra	de l	Lev	el					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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					G	rade	Le	vel						Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
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						Grac	le L	_ev	el					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
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													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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 Grade Component	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 Cor	nparison				,	
04	2021					
	2019	43%	67%	-24%	58%	-15%
Cohort Cor	mparison	-44%			•	
05	2021					
	2019	55%	67%	-12%	56%	-1%
Cohort Cor	mparison	-43%			•	

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

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

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

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		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81/23%	79/30%	79/54%
English Language Arts	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
	All Students	81/10%	77/23%	79/53%
Mathematics	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/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	73/27%	71/52%	70/61%	
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	52/27%	49/59%	54/61%	
	Students With Disabilities	17/29%	16/44%	17/65%	
	English Language Learners	10/20%	11/45%	11/55%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	73/18%	72/38%	70/70%	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	52/15%	50/46%	54/70%	
	Students With Disabilities	17/24%	17/41%	17/82%	
	English Language Learners	10/20%	11/27%	11/45%	
		Grade 3			
	Number/% Proficiency	Grade 3 Fall	Winter	Spring	
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 63/51%	Spring 62/65%	
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall			
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	Fall 62/48%	63/51%	62/65%	
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall 62/48% 40/50%	63/51% 38/50%	62/65% 39/72%	
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language	Fall 62/48% 40/50% 18/22% 10/20% Fall	63/51% 38/50% 17/24%	62/65% 39/72% 17/24% 9/33% Spring	
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students	Fall 62/48% 40/50% 18/22% 10/20%	63/51% 38/50% 17/24% 10/20%	62/65% 39/72% 17/24% 9/33%	
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall 62/48% 40/50% 18/22% 10/20% Fall	63/51% 38/50% 17/24% 10/20% Winter	62/65% 39/72% 17/24% 9/33% Spring	
Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically	Fall 62/48% 40/50% 18/22% 10/20% Fall 62/13%	63/51% 38/50% 17/24% 10/20% Winter 63/35%	62/65% 39/72% 17/24% 9/33% Spring 63/62%	

		Grade 4		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/21%	64/36%	65/46%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	41/24%	37/35%	41/44%
Alto	Students With Disabilities	22/18%	21/19%	21/19%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/33%	3/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/14%	65/38%	65/67%
Mathematics	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
	All Students	56/23%	53/32%	55/36%
English Language Arts	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
	All Students	56/14%	52/25%	55/47%
Mathematics	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
	All Students			53/25%
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			33/21%
	Students With Disabilities			24/13%
	English Language Learners			4/0%

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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.

Last Modified: 4/26/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 17 of 21

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

Area of

and

Focus
Description

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.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

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.

Monitoring: We will monitor it via the iReady progress monitoring tool. Assessments are administered

3 times a year.

Person

responsible for

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy: 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..

Rationale for

Evidencebased

iReady is an evidence-based program.

Strategy:

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

and

Focus Description

At our 3rd progress monitoring last year, our ESE students scored significantly less

proficient than their non-disabled peers. They also showed lower gains.

Rationale:

Measurable

Our 3-5 students with disabilities will be at least 45% proficient in reading and in math as

Outcome: measured by the 3rd administration of iReady.

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

Person

responsible

for

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

monitoring outcome:

Small group intervention with skill deficit data provided by iReady will be implemented at all

Evidencebased Strategy:

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 Evidencebased

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.

Strategy:

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 (lucretia.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 <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.