

Okaloosa County School District

# Wright Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Wright Elementary School

305 LANG RD, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Suzanne Boyd

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (67%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Wright Elementary School

305 LANG RD, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547

[ 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	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

### School Grades History

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

To inspire a lifelong passion for learning while providing a welcoming, safe, and nurturing environment for all stakeholders. We are R.E.A.D.Y.!

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

R – respectful and responsible – norms established that build positive relationships and a shared commitment to the academic and social/emotional growth of Wright Elementary students

E – Engaged – multiple avenues for open communication among staff and among all stakeholders; meaningful parent involvement opportunities through consistent communication and invitation (scheduled curriculum nights, parent/family activities, student activities, and events throughout the school year; diversity of cultures is recognized and included; opportunities for community/local business involvement

A – Accountable – professional development that assists staff in developing skills to create and support and positive school climate; development of short- and long-range plans for visible improvements to the campus

D – Dependable – calendar of activities and events maintained and provided as relevant to staff, families; routines that serve as part of our school culture that staff and families know they can depend on

Y – Your personal best – recognizing and celebrating staff members, students; support and encouragement for staff-selected personal/ professional development that contributes to the mission of Wright Elementary.

### 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
Boyd, Suzanne	Principal	Provide instructional leadership and maintain a safe school environment by: following policies and procedures, maintaining school budget, developing school master schedule and calendar, hiring and evaluating staff, overseeing ESE and Title I departments, overseeing implementation of adopted curriculum, monitoring student achievement and behavior, engaging parents, developing leaders within the school staff.
Denton, Michael	Assistant Principal	Coordinating and implementing new teacher training and support/mentoring, developing master class lists/groups in FOCUS information system, monitoring student academics and behavior, evaluating staff, monitoring facilities, safety
Feldman, Laurie	Dean	Monitors and oversees student discipline referral system in FOCUS; provides check ins for students daily. Communicates with parents and teachers to develop positive interventions for student behaviors. Works with school counselor and administration to support systems and routines by providing training and scheduling support. Serves on MTSS committee and assists in developing strategies for students, both academic and behavioral.
Maxey, Ryan	Teacher, ESE	Provides leadership in ESE department through previous ESE experience. Collaborates with classroom teachers and other ESE teachers to schedule and implement services for students with IEPs. Serves on MTSS committee and works cooperatively with MTSS team to identify strategies and provide support for students. Assists with testing and scheduling of testing.
Raines, Mary	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development and support in the area of ELA. Meets with teachers to develop lesson plans and to demonstrate model lessons; to provide instruction and assistance with benchmarks/standards, assessments, balanced literacy model. Meets with administration weekly and assists with data collection and review and planning for improvement.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Suzanne Boyd

**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.*

5

**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.*

9



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

32

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

640

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

11

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

12

## 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	109	115	132	94	91	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	1	21	21	14	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	7	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	15	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	1	0	9	12	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	25	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	0	12	28	25	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	1	0	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/29/2022

**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	109	136	94	79	92	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	12	11	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	4	12	13	11	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	4	7	9	8	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
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	4	9	10	11	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	109	136	94	79	92	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	614	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	12	11	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	4	12	13	11	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	
Course failure in Math	4	7	9	8	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	
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	4	9	10	11	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	

## 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	44%	61%	56%				61%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						72%	64%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						74%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	47%	50%				74%	73%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						79%	70%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						61%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	63%	59%				61%	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	51%	66%	-15%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	67%	-7%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	67%	-5%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	65%	73%	-8%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	74%	-9%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	82%	71%	11%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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	20	56	58	25	44	50					
ELL	33	49	42	46	50	33	28				
BLK	43	69		46	58						
HSP	35	47	44	42	46	28	23				
MUL	55	71		45	67						
WHT	50	69	64	65	73		47				
FRL	42	56	41	49	57	48	33				
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	17	50	56	28	48	44	26				
ELL	35	67	58	44	54	55	32				
BLK	56			41			36				
HSP	34	48	55	42	48	50	35				
MUL	68			46							
WHT	62	66		65	63		76				
FRL	52	62	58	53	48	31	51				
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	34	65	68	68	63	46	38				
ELL	52	69	77	71	79	73	50				
BLK	51	71	71	68	74	50	58				
HSP	55	71	73	70	82	75	52				
MUL	80	82		85	91						
WHT	65	73	80	75	76	50	76				
FRL	60	71	74	73	79	61	57				

### 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	51
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	41
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	60
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	
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	61
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?

ELA learning gains have remained at 50% or more each year with the exception of one year with ELLs at 42%.

ELLs overall achievement has shown a sharp decline in the last three years.

SWD have been low historically with their ELA learning gains at 50% and above historically.

The most significant drop from 2019 to 2022 is math achievement among SWDs (from 68% to 25% proficient).

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

SWDs both ELA and math demonstrate a significant need for improvement of overall proficiency.

ELLs also demonstrate a significant need in ELA and math for improvement of overall proficiency.

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

50% of the 3rd grade students experienced ELA teacher transitions during the school year. There was also a change in the ESE teacher in the middle of the school year. Additionally there was a transition in Title I teachers in the middle of the school year. The lack of reading endorsed teachers has put a strain on the Title I and ESE departments.

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

Math achievement increased by 1%, math learning gains increased by 9%, math lowest 25th percentile increased by 7%. From 2019 to 2021 ELA learning gains decreased 9% but from 2021 to 2022 it only decreased 3%.

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

Several math teachers in K-5th have completed CGI training. There has been more stability & consistency amongst staff who teach math.

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

An additional Title I teacher has been hired. A retired teacher is coming back to assist with tutoring. More teachers are getting reading endorsed so that they can facilitate more Tier III groups in order to keep intensive intervention groups small. Data chats will continue with an emphasis on next steps based on iReady and FAST data.

**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 teachers are participating in full day professional development and are completing learning walks at other schools to assist in fully implementing the Benchmark curriculum. A literacy PLC will be established to communicate information gathered during Literacy Leadership meetings. Ongoing mini PD sessions will be provided before school as scheduled and during the 20-25 minute weekly grade level/ data teams meetings as scheduled. Ghost walks will occur for both ELA and math teachers with a focus on sharing of best practices in routines and instructional strategies.

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

Plan of Care tutoring before, during, and after school;  
Data chats will be conducted on a regular basis focusing on best practice in Tier I instruction.  
Ongoing professional development will included topics to address small group instruction, implementation of Benchmark Advanced, and implementation of iReady with a focus on how to use the reports to progress monitor.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the overall decrease in student performance, it is determined that tier 1 instruction should be a focus to ensure it is consistently on grade level (ALL students have access to quality tier 1 instruction) and suitably rigorous as defined by the grade level's benchmarks. Our expectation is that students at all levels of performance are consistently provided grade-appropriate instruction that allows for high expectations and regular opportunities for deep engagement.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Upon completion of F.A.S.T. PM3 at the end of the 2022-2023 school year, the school average scale score for ELA will increase as follows:

5th grade - from 304 at PM1 to 321 by PM3

4th grade - from 290 at PM1 to 311 by PM3

3rd grade - from 277 at PM1 to 300 by PM3

**Monitoring:**

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

Long term progress monitoring will occur with mid- and end-of-year assessments (F.A.S.T. PM2 and PM3).

Short term progress monitoring will occur through weekly literacy classroom walk throughs (conducted by school administration and shared/debriefed/reflected upon with Literacy Leadership Team and classroom teachers); gradebook analysis of unit assessments, monthly standards mastery through i-Ready Reading, and data chats with grade levels.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Suzanne Boyd (boyds@okaloosaschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The balanced literacy model will be implemented to provide engaging interactive whole group mini lessons as part of regular tier 1 instruction; use of Benchmark Advance curriculum and assessments. i-Ready will continue to be used with a focus on filling learning gaps for all students. ESOL teacher and interpreters will support students by working with teachers to provide pre-lessons that support vocabulary development and reading of grade level texts in advance of the classroom Benchmark Advance lessons.

Use of state and district resources such as pacing guides, ALDs, and assessment limits information will also be part of our instructional planning and strategies development.

**Rationale for**

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Implementation of the balanced literacy model will help teachers in planning the reading instructional block for most effective use of time and resources. Small group instruction, text-based writing, stations, purposeful read alouds, and most importantly, interactive whole group instruction will be necessary components of classroom instruction. Resources that are evidence based and support the benchmarks include i-Ready and Toolbox, Benchmark Advance curriculum, pacing guides, writing rubric.

### used for selecting this strategy.

#### 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.

Provide ongoing professional development to support general education best practices focusing on tier 1 instruction.

**Person Responsible** Mary Raines (carnahanm@okaloosaschools.com)

Conduct administrative literacy walk throughs focusing on student engagement to include establishment of routines, engaging whole group lessons that scaffold instruction for all learners, visual, tactile, and kinesthetic supports (anchor charts, texts, books, modeling, text marking, use of physical space for student collaboration, evidence of components of the balanced literacy model).

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Boyd (boyds@okaloosaschools.com)

Use questioning and discussion techniques to provoke higher order thinking during student collaborative groups, whole group interactive instruction, and small groups.

**Person Responsible** Michael Denton (dentonm@okaloosaschools.com)

Implement curriculum based professional learning communities to provide opportunities for sharing of best practices through collegial conversations, vertical planning and discussions, and planning of student and family curriculum events.

**Person Responsible** Ryan Maxey (ryan.maxey@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**

Curriculum materials: Magnetic Reading, Benchmark Advance intervention resources, and Max Scholar (multi-sensory)

Practices: balanced literacy model with a focus on interactive whole group instruction, using data from STAR and i-Ready assessments to guide instruction

Wright English Language Learner population continues to grow each year. Currently, 50% of our kindergarten students are new ELLs. First grade is 39% ELLs; second grade is 35% ELLs. ESE and ESOL students overlap in data.

Based on review of data, our area of focus is to improve the quality of tier instruction in all classrooms. Overall reading scores dropped at Wright Elementary in the 2021-2022 school year, and subgroups including ESE and ESOL were significantly impacted. While small group supports (such as Title I pull-out and push-in, ESOL pull-out and push-in) are present, the impact of quality tier 1 instruction in the grade-appropriate curriculum cannot be withheld. Wright instructional staff believe that if we improve the implementation and delivery of the balanced literacy model in every classroom, and if we implement tier 1 instruction with student engagement and high expectations for all, our students will be able to access the grade level content and make strides in their learning.

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

Curriculum materials: i-Ready Phonics for Reading, Benchmark Advance intervention resources, i-Ready toolbox, Orton-Gillingham (multi-sensory) resources in ESE resource classroom

Practices: balanced literacy model with a focus on interactive whole group instruction, using data from F.A.S.T. and i-Ready assessments to guide instruction

Based on review of data, our area of focus is to improve the quality of tier instruction in all classrooms. Overall reading scores dropped at Wright Elementary in the 2021-2022 school year, and subgroups including ESE and ESOL were significantly impacted. ESE and ESOL overlap in data. While small group supports (such as Title I pull-out and push-in, ESOL pull-out and push-in) are present, the impact of quality tier 1 instruction in the grade-appropriate curriculum cannot be withheld. Wright instructional staff believe that if we improve the implementation and delivery of the balanced literacy model in every classroom, and if we implement tier 1 instruction with student engagement and high expectations for all, our students will be able to access the grade level content and make strides in their learning.

**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)**

Upon completion of F.A.S.T. PM3 at the end of the 2022-2023 school year, the school average percentile for K-2 ELA will be in the developing (60% - 79%) range when averaged by grade level and by the K-2nd grade group.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Upon completion of F.A.S.T. PM3 at the end of the 2022-2023 school year, the school average scale score for ELA will increase as follows:

5th grade - from 304 at PM1 to 321 by PM3

4th grade - from 290 at PM1 to 311 by PM3

3rd grade - from 277 at PM1 to 300 by PM3

ESE subgroup average scale score will increase as follows:

5th grade ESE - from 283 at PM1 to 300 by PM3.

4th grade ESE - from 286 at PM1 to 307 by PM3.

3rd grade ESE - from 275 at PM1 to 298 by PM3.

### **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.

Long term progress monitoring will occur with mid- and end-of-year assessments (F.A.S.T. PM2 and PM3). Short term progress monitoring will occur through weekly literacy classroom walk throughs (conducted by school administration and shared/debriefed/reflected upon with Literacy Leadership Team and classroom teachers); gradebook analysis of unit assessments, monthly standards mastery through i-Ready Reading, and data chats with grade levels.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boyd, Suzanne, boyds@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. Â§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?

The balanced literacy model will be implemented to provide engaging interactive whole group mini lessons as part of regular tier 1 instruction; use of Benchmark Advance curriculum and assessments. i-Ready will continue to be used with a focus on filling learning gaps for all students. ESOL teacher and interpreters will support students by working with teachers to provide pre-lessons that support vocabulary development and reading of grade level texts in advance of the classroom Benchmark Advance lessons.

Use of state and district resources such as pacing guides, ALDs, and assessment limits information will also be part of our instructional planning and strategies development.

**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?

Implementation of the balanced literacy model will help teachers in planning the reading instructional block for most effective use of time and resources. Small group instruction, text-based writing, stations, purposeful read alouds, and most importantly, interactive whole group instruction will be necessary components of classroom instruction. Resources that are evidence based and support the benchmarks include i-Ready and Toolbox, Benchmark Advance curriculum, pacing guides, writing rubric.

**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
<p>Literacy Leadership - establishment of a literacy leadership team that meets at least monthly to monitor data, make data driven decisions, establish purposeful PLCs and professional learning opportunities, implement a process for monitoring literacy instruction (including reflection and provision of feedback to teachers), and ensures resources, materials, and schedules that support literacy instruction.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching - establishment of ongoing professional development that supports literacy instruction and provides the knowledge and resources to assist teachers in implementing effective balanced literacy blocks.</p> <p>Assessment - both short and long term progress monitoring (F.A.S.T., i-Ready, Benchmark Advance assessments)</p> <p>Professional Learning - Wright has a full time ELA instructional coach who implements ongoing professional development to grade levels, small groups, the faculty, and one on one.</p>	<p>Boyd, Suzanne, boyds@okaloosaschools.com</p>

## 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.

A PBIS team has been established and implementation is taking place. This program involves recognition of students for following the school wide expectations and exhibiting behaviors related to the the PBIS rubric. Classes are also recognized for positive behaviors in the cafeteria. In addition, students are recognized for academic success following each i-Ready diagnostic and at the end of each quarter.

Systems are in place that allow for collaboration between teachers, support staff, and administration through regularly scheduled leadership meetings, faculty meetings, grade level meetings, and data chats. In addition, the Reading Coach and Math Coach schedule professional learning communities with grade levels.

Teachers encouraged to perform ghost walks to observe classroom structures and procedures in all levels of the school.

New teacher training has been expanded to include second year teachers.

Parents are invited and encouraged to visit the school (have lunch with their students, attend events during the school day such as honor roll, Thanksgiving lunch). Communication is maintained through a monthly newsletter, on the school's web page and Facebook page, and through conferences and phone calls.

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

Training has begun for all teachers and staff in the PBIS rubric, and expectations are being reviewed through leadership meetings and faculty meetings. Teachers share school-wide expectations and the Title I Compact with

families during open house and parent conferences throughout the year. PBIS strategies are shared and discussed during School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. MTSS committee meets weekly to address student behaviors and collaborate with teachers to develop strategies for reteaching the expectations.

Administration, Social Committee, and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) sponsors events and activities to show

appreciation to teachers and staff throughout the year. PTO also sponsors events throughout the year to raise money to help support student recognition programs.

At Wright Elementary, we work together as a staff "family" to promote a positive environment through planned events as well as through our daily interactions with students and their families.