

Okaloosa County School District

Lula J. Edge Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lula J. Edge Elementary School

300 HIGHWAY 85 N, Niceville, FL 32578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Kearley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
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: B (61%) 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (69%)
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.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lula J. Edge Elementary School

300 HIGHWAY 85 N, Niceville, FL 32578

[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	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

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.

Our District has a shared Mission to place students on a pathway to success by providing high quality instruction, a wide array of marketable experiences, and unparalleled extracurricular opportunities while developing relationships that meet both their academic and emotional needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school's vision is that we encourage all members of the Edge community to R.O.A.R.

We are a school filled with traditions, and continue to encourage and excel in the area of academic excellence. As Edge Tigers we expect all students to show Respect, Ownership, Acts of Kindness and Responsibilities throughout their everyday lives in school and in the greater community. Our students and staff follow a R.O.A.R. matrix in all areas of our campus and posters are displayed as reminders around the school campus.

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
Kearley, Melissa	Principal	Instructional School Leader
Anderson, Kathy	Assistant Principal	Instructional School Leader
Lewis, Maria	School Counselor	Testing Administrator, Social Emotional Learning Support, 504 Coordinator, MTSS Coordinator...
Early, Kristen	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Melissa Kearley

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

530

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

8

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	85	96	91	101	85	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	14	13	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	15	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	7	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	11	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	1	5	15	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		

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		

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	97	91	89	97	77	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	16	14	12	13	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	1	5	13	15	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	1	3	5	9	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	5	25	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	1	4	10	22	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	2	3	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	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	70%	61%	56%				82%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						74%	64%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						55%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	47%	50%				81%	73%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%						64%	70%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						56%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	63%	59%				76%	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	81%	66%	15%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	67%	17%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	67%	10%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

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	82%	73%	9%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	74%	11%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	70%	71%	-1%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	74%	63%	11%	53%	21%
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	30	41	29	42	44	23	33				
BLK	50			31	50						
HSP	68	56		73	63						
MUL	78	82		72	82		92				
WHT	69	72	48	76	59	48	69				
FRL	54	58	22	57	52	40	60				
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	49	27	18	51	27		29				
BLK	60			47							
HSP	79			68							
MUL	78			74							
WHT	77	66	33	72	56	33	75				
FRL	56	38		52	38		48				
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	56	60	38	54	52	37	63				
BLK	67			79							
HSP	76	60		71	90						
MUL	76	58		75	67						
WHT	85	77	65	83	61	52	76				
FRL	75	67	57	71	59	52	63				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	81
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	63
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	49
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?

Our SWD subgroup is defined as having below 41% proficiency as designated on the Federal Point Index.

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

the 21-22 3rd Grade SWD were 38% proficient and the 4th Grade SWD were 33% proficient.

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

We believe that learning loss due to COVID was a main contributing factor to low performance in this sub-group.

The action steps our school is taking this year to support this specific subgroup include the following:

- Utilize small group instruction based on ongoing data analysis of iReady to identify targeted areas of need.
- Differentiate activities in the ESE and Gen Ed classroom during small group to target specific student areas of need.
- Utilize Orton Gillingham/Max Scholar/Phonics for Reading/iReady to provide a multi-sensory approach to enhance learning.
- Students will set S.M.A.R.T. goals with students using their iReady and F.A.S.T. data.
- POC tutoring before, during and after school

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

ELA learning gains increased by 10%
 Lowest 25% increased by 14%
 Math Learning gains showed 7% increase
 Lowest 25% increased by 15%

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

Acceleration Station was added to the schedule to add additional support to the lower quartile students according to the iReady data.

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

- POC tutoring
- Targeted small group instruction
- Teacher professional development with a focus on interactive whole group
- Acceleration Station
- Orten-Gillingham

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.

ESE teachers received extensive OG training over the summer.
All staff received iReady training on how to analyze and use the iReady data reports to drive instruction.
ELA and Math Instructional coaches are facilitating PD for all teachers x3 in the first semester to support a better understanding of the B.E.S.T. standards and the support guides that have been provided.

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

Acceleration Station to focus on supporting Bubble student who show the need for additional support
POC tutoring before, during and after school to support our lower quartile students who are in need of addition support without having to remove them from the grade level classroom instruction.

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.

21-22 FSA Data
3rd Grade 38% Proficient (16 students)
4th Grade 33% Proficient (15 students)
5th Grade 8% Proficient (13 students)

Measurable Outcome:

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

All SWD in 3-5 will be at least 50% proficient on the F.A.S.T. PM3

Monitoring:

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

During weekly walkthroughs, Lesson Plans, PLC Meetings, formative and summative assessments, PLC meeting notes, Data chat discussions, station accountability pieces and student work samples.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Kearley (kearleym@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Orten-Gillingham's multi-sensory approach

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

High impact, evidence based program that is multi-sensory selected by the district and support through a week long training as an initiative specifically targeting SWD.

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.

Differentiated small groups.

Using Accountability with students

Implementation of the Benchmark Curriculum and the Orten-Gillingham program

Using data to analyze student growth

Attendance and participation on grade level meetings and PLCs

Person Responsible

Kristen Early (earlyk@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.

As a school we encourage all of our students and staff to R.O.A.R. By showing Respect, Ownership, Acts of Kindness, and Responsibility we can create the supportive fulfilling environment for everyone in our building. Our faculty works hard and spends a great deal of time creating a comfortable and adaptive classroom environment for their students. Students have the ability to recognize the teachers or staff members that make the biggest impact on them by completing a "You Inspire Me" nomination. The students are able to read them on the morning show and have their picture taken with the person who nominated them. We feel that it is important to keep an open line of communication and a transparent front with our families and community by sharing with them the instructional direction of our school and the achievement levels of our students.

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

We have identified internal stake holders who act as grade chairs of their individual teams. From the community we have a very active and involved PTO that had raised Adopt-A-Classroom funds to support all of the teacher classrooms. As the principal it is my responsibility to communicate the instructional focus areas for our school and how we plan to implement them within the classrooms. I have scheduled monthly meetings with the SAC president to touch base and keep him informed of our school's progress towards meeting instructional goals.