Bob Sikes Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bob Sikes Elementary School

425 ADAMS DR, Crestview, FL 32536

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Laurren Seegars

Start Date for this Principal: 4/26/2011

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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

Bob Sikes Elementary School

425 ADAMS DR, Crestview, FL 32536

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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.

Motivate and mold individuals to have the tools and skills necessary to make a positive impact on the community. "Working together to build the future."

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hayden, Victoria	Principal	Instructional and operational leader.
Anderson, Amy	Assistant Principal	Support the principal with instructional and operational initiatives.
Tatman, Amanda		Schedules remediation support for students K-5; organizes paraprofessionals to extend support available, encourages parent and family collaboration in learning with specific events throughout the year.
Vance, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	Provides support and accommodations for students identified as eligible for ESE services. Case manager for IEPs, supports teachers to provide accommodations best for each individual student.
Cox, Angelique	School Counselor	Support students and parents to help overcome academic and social/ behavioral challenges to success. Coordinates and plans state- and district-mandated assessments, including those who administer the assessments. MTSS coordinator.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 4/26/2011, Laurren Seegars

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

840

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

7

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	120	133	151	151	145	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	842
Attendance below 90 percent	0	25	34	16	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	1	2	12	11	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	1	2	7	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	19	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	3	13	20	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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	115	135	130	137	121	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	795
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	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	34	50	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	115	135	130	137	121	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	795
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	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	34	50	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	54%	61%	56%				56%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						56%	64%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						51%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	49%	47%	50%				63%	73%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%						56%	70%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						49%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	63%	59%				53%	62%	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	55%	66%	-11%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	67%	-9%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	67%	-16%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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					
	2019	63%	73%	-10%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	74%	-10%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	71%	-9%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	63%	-10%	53%	0%
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	25	38	33	20	36	33	42				
BLK	30	46		33	38						
HSP	62	63		50	68		50				
MUL	49	52		44	40	8	50				
WHT	57	61	55	51	51	48	66				
FRL	42	57	55	36	46	40	49				
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	29	39	36	23	39	38	17				
BLK	37	38		36	40		18				
HSP	52	75		35	42		40				
MUL	51			50			64				
WHT	64	64	50	57	57	56	56				
FRL	47	50	45	42	51	53	31				
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	31	39	38	33	52	48	29				
ELL	25			64							
BLK	23	54	62	33	39	54	33				
HSP	51	36		59	55		36				
MUL	56	71		63	60						
WHT	60	58	53	68	59	50	57				
FRL	44	52	50	56	51	53	47				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Percentage proficient has dropped in both ELA and Math for grades 3-5. The subgroup comprised of ESE students has been posting low achievement/growth scores historically; the ESSA subgroup of students who are Black is new to the school.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA -- language and vocabulary across grade levels and subgroups need improvement. Geometry and algebraic thinking across grade levels and subgroups show the greatest need for improvement.

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

Our third grade scores were particularly low this assessment. One contributing factor is the upset and uncertainty of the educational environment during COVID. Acquisition of foundation skills was negatively impacted for this grade level, resulting in significant gaps in performance. Additionally, a significant absence of third grade teachers throughout the first nine weeks and continuing throughout the year hampered instructional growth. Teachers missed between two and 15 weeks of school due to sickness, and students were also absent once teachers returned. Additional support is needed, particularly in the core ELA and Math areas, for remedial instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our science scores showed the most growth.

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

The use of Study Island has proven to be helpful.

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

Teachers and paraprofessionals will focus on fundamentals in small group settings, emphasizing areas data demonstrates are lacking.

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 and Math coaches are guiding teachers through B.E.S.T. standards and modeling best practices in classrooms. Data chats are also occurring during meetings with the coaches to keep teachers in their classrooms as much as possible with their students. iReady diversified training is planned through the district, and the ELA Coach, Title I teacher, and Assistant Principal attend scheduled RAISE webinars.

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

Assigning a paraprofessional to each grade level to support in-class remediation efforts; require the use of Study Island with fidelity on a regular basis (at least every other week); hiring 4 tutors who will work with students during the school day, with an emphasis on K-2; after-school tutoring; homework help (before school every day);

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	FSA scores were lower for this group than for cohort groups, and growth was not as robust as other groups.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Students will improve the use of grade-level vocabulary and language in order to demonstrate increased proficiency and growth on ELA grade-level skills.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and administrators will monitor iReady diagnostics and F.A.S.T. assessments throughout the year, adjusting instruction and support as data indicates.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Victoria Hayden (haydenv@okaloosaschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Orton-Gillingham for K-3 ESE students, Benchmark Advance remediation materials for 4-5 ESE students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	ESE teacher was trained in the proper use of Orton-Gillingham strategies in the summer. This approach has shown improvement in students' use of phonics, phonemics, and vocabulary. The district approved the use of Benchmark Advance to align with state standards, and the support portion of that curriculum is used with ESE students.

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.

Attend Orton-Gillingham training over the summer (ESE teacher K. Vance)

Person Responsible	Kelly Vance (kelly.vance@okaloosaschools.com)

Administer iReady diagnostics as scheduled by the district (ESE teacher K. Vance, ESE teacher K. Johnson)

Person Responsible	Kassy Johnson (kassy.johnson@okaloosaschools.com)

Analyze and discuss data in grade level meetings and professional development (Victoria Hayden, Amy Anderson)

Person Responsible	Victoria Hayden (haydenv@okaloosaschools.com)

Adjust support as needed according to data (ESE teachers and Classroom teachers, throughout the year)

Person Responsible	Kelly Vance (kelly.vance@okaloosaschools.com)

Students in the identified subgroup will be invited to after-school plan of care tutoring.

Person Responsible	Angelique Cox (coxa@okaloosaschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	15 African-American students scored below proficiency on the state FSA assessment in ELA.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	75% of the students in the identified subgroup will increase proficiency to on-grade level by the last F.A.S.T. session.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Students in this subgroup will receive support through classroom small group and Title I pull-out or push-in targeting areas of specific identified need from FSA scores and iReady diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Tatman (amanda.tatman@okaloosaschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Title I teachers will utilize data generated in the initial iReady diagnostic and first F.A.S.T. assessment to create and deliver targeted instruction in a small-group setting throughout the year. Adjustments will be made as following diagnostics and assessments indicate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Small-group, targeted instruction using specific curriculum aimed at student deficiencies is shown to increase student growth and "close gaps" students experience which prevents them from making adequate gains at the same pace as their peers.

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 identified in this subgroup are scheduled on the Title I teachers' roster for targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Amanda Tatman (amanda.tatman@okaloosaschools.com)

Students identified in the subgroup are invited to after-school tutoring.

Person Responsible	Angelique Cox (coxa@okaloosaschools.com)

Student scores on iReady diagnostics and F.A.S.T. assessments will be monitored and discussed during grade level meeting data chats and professional development with coaches and administrators. Groups will be adjusted and student goals adjusted based on data.

Person Responsible	Victoria Hayden (haydenv@okaloosaschools.com)

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

Utilization of Benchmark Advance curriculum, with an emphasis on phonemic awareness. Use of newly hired in-school tutors to provide additional targeted, small group support.

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

Use of Benchmark Advance Curriculum, small group targeted instruction on areas of need (vocabulary, phonemic awareness). Small groups are teacher-groups, Title I pull-out or push-in groups, as well as paraprofessional support hired specifically to support these students during the school day. Paraprofessionals follow classroom teacher lesson plans targeting individual student needs.

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)

Students in grades K-2 demonstrated weakness in phonics and phonemic awareness. Using a multi-sensory approach, teachers and paraprofessionals will target these skills in small group and one-on-one

(as appropriate) instruction. All students will show a 70% proficiency or growth when measured with iReady diagnostic and F.A.S.T. assessments of the B.E.S.T. standards.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in grades 3-5 demonstrated weakness in phonemic awareness and vocabulary. Teachers and paraprofessionals will, working with small groups and one-on-one (as applicable) target these skills and fill in gaps based on data collected from iReady diagnostics and F.A.S.T. assessments of the B.E.S.T. standards. All students will show a 70% growth or proficiency compared with last year's data.

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.

Administrators will monitor instruction for fidelity during walkthroughs, observations and visits throughout the year. Administrators, classroom teachers, ESE teachers and Title I teachers will monitor data generated from iReady and F.A.S.T. assessments for the first two administrations, making changes in academic approaches as data indicates.

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

Hayden, Victoria, haydenv@okaloosaschools.com

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?

Teachers in K-2 will utilize practices that align with standards requiring multi-sensory approach (for example, "Phonics Dance"), as well as iReady diagnostics. Explicit, targeted instruction based on iReady results for small groups and individuals will be delivered via classroom teacher and paraprofessionals pulling small groups under the teacher's discretion. Teachers are using Benchmark Advance, a state- and district-approved curriculum. Teachers in 3-5 will also utilize iReady diagnostics to target individual and small group gaps in reading and learning. Benchmark Advance is the classroom content that has been approved by the state and district as meeting the B.E.S.T. standards. Paraprofessionals will support students in small groups targeting specific skills at teacher direction. Tutoring is offered for students who were retained or are in danger of being retained, both after school and during the school day (K-1). School-day K-1 tutors are trained by district staff.

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?

Phonics-based instruction, through whole group initiatives and the use of iReady diagnostics and associated tools, both show a proven record for increase student proficiency in the use of phonics and phonemes, as well as increase in reading fluency. Benchmark Advance is a new curriculum, but is aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards as measured by the F.A.S.T. assessment. Tutoring, small group and individual instruction are all strategies that have a history of closing gaps in student skill and understanding.

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
Literacy Leadership Literacy team is comprised of grade level chairs, administrators, and other teachers who want to participate. Meetings are scheduled monthly to review data and common assessments. Administrators conduct weekly walkthroughs with "look-fors" and "listen-fors" and share information with grade level chairs.	Hayden, Victoria, haydenv@okaloosaschools.com
Literacy Coaching Bob Sikes has a literacy coach assigned to the school. This coach leads scheduled professional development by grade level, in which data chats also occur. The coach is also available and encouraged to model best practices for literacy instruction in classrooms. Collaborative planning time is provided so teachers can work together either in grade levels, grade bands, or for vertical alignment and coach each other.	Hayden, Victoria, haydenv@okaloosaschools.com
Assessment All students take iReady diagnostics three times a year and teachers base instructional support and enhancement on these diagnostics. All students take the F.A.S.T. assessment 3 times a year, and teachers use these results to plan instruction and support as well. Each grade level is required to give at least two common assessments for the purpose of identifying trends of areas of success or challenge.	Hayden, Victoria, haydenv@okaloosaschools.com
Professional Learning Professional Development for all grade levels is scheduled throughout the first semester. Teachers attend with their grade level at this school and with teachers from another school. Coaching is available in class as well as the coaches leading professional development. PD is targeted to the needs of the students and to meet the SPP and SIP focus goals.	Hayden, Victoria, haydenv@okaloosaschools.com

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Bob Sikes Elementary has a school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention System. The acronym PAWS helps students and staff remember the must-haves for positive interactions. P = Practice safety. A = Act Responsibly. W = Work hard. S = Show respect. Each week, teachers identify two students for recognition and administration visits the classroom to recognize these students and give them a prize to reinforce the making of positive choices. Administration has set aside the first 15 minutes of each day for instruction in

Zones of Regulation, Sanford Harmony and emphasis on PAWS. Teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals can award tokens to a class or individual students for displaying the PAWS characteristics. Teachers can not give tokens to their own classes. When a class earns 25 tokens, they earn a reward that the teacher and/or class has set as a reward for meeting the goal.

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

Teachers - teach and model the PAWS strategy in their classrooms, as well as leading the first 15 minutes of each day in lessons from Zones of Regulation, Sanford Harmony, and emphasizing an aspect of PAWS. Administrators require PAWS be posted in each classroom, and provided the first 15 minutes of each day for instruction in this content. Students are responsible and rewarded for making their own positive choices. The school has a PBIS committee that meets regularly to discuss strategies and their effectiveness, and to recommend ideas and changes as needed. Parents are included in the process through participation in the SAC committee, and through teacher and school newsletters and updates.