

Okaloosa County School District

Longwood 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Longwood Elementary School

50 HOLLY AVE, Shalimar, FL 32579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Tucker

Start Date for this Principal: 5/24/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 79% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (56%) |
| 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Longwood Elementary School

50 HOLLY AVE, Shalimar, FL 32579

[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 | 79% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 72% |

School Grades History

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

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.

Empowering each student to believe they can be responsible and successful lifelong learners.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Jones, Lisa | Assistant Principal | LLT Point of Contact Data analysis Progress monitoring Walkthroughs/Observations Feedback to teachers |
| Bailey, Robyn | Instructional Coach | Coaching cycle Data analysis Feedback to teachers |
| Johnston, Lara | Teacher, K-12 | Title I reading teacher Data analysis Remediation teacher for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students Provides instructional strategies for paraprofessionals Literacy committee chairperson LLT member and recorder |
| Nguyen, Thuy | Teacher, K-12 | ESOL teacher Literacy committee |
| Rodden, Sherri | Teacher, K-12 | 5th grade ELA teacher Grade level chair Social committee LLT member |
| Steber, Denise | | 3rd grade teacher Grade level chair School Literacy committee LLT member |
| Luallen, Kim | Teacher, K-12 | Kindergergarten teacher Grade level chair Math Committee member LLT member |
| Chancellor, Joey | Principal | Data Analysis Progress Monitoring Walkthrough/Observations Feedback to teachers |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/24/2022, Lisa Tucker

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

552

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.

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 | 80 | 93 | 89 | 105 | 69 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 516 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 18 | 15 | 21 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 20 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 18 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 6 | 43 | 20 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

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 | 2 | 9 | 46 | 22 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |

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 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | |
|--|-------------|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 95 | 89 | 83 | 103 | 74 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 552 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 32 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 45 | 11 | 35 | 41 | 25 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 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 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |

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 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 95 | 89 | 83 | 103 | 74 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 552 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 32 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 45 | 11 | 35 | 41 | 25 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 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 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |

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 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 46% | 61% | 56% | | | | 54% | 67% | 57% |

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | | | | | | 58% | 64% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | | | | | | 54% | 57% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 40% | 47% | 50% | | | | 54% | 73% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 50% | | | | | | 58% | 70% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | | | | | | 42% | 60% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 39% | 63% | 59% | | | | 45% | 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 | 42% | 66% | -24% | 58% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 67% | -8% | 58% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 67% | -13% | 56% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |

| 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 | 42% | 73% | -31% | 62% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 74% | -10% | 64% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 44% | 71% | -27% | 60% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 63% | -22% | 53% | -12% |
| 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 | 32 | 37 | 36 | 36 | 50 | 50 | 44 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 47 | 43 | 26 | 48 | 46 | 19 | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 67 | | 19 | 44 | | 8 | | | | |
| HSP | 25 | 47 | 46 | 29 | 47 | 48 | 24 | | | | |
| MUL | 57 | 64 | | 57 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 78 | | 56 | 51 | | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 56 | 42 | 39 | 49 | 48 | 31 | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 54 | 50 | 20 | 21 | | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 39 | 50 | 23 | 39 | 42 | 11 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 31 | | 19 | 8 | | 15 | | | | |
| HSP | 23 | 41 | 54 | 24 | 38 | 45 | 18 | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | | | 29 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 52 | | 49 | 26 | | 39 | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 33 | 47 | 26 | 24 | 42 | 14 | | | | |
| 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 | 41 | 62 | 57 | 49 | 56 | 46 | 41 | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 54 | 52 | 49 | 61 | 39 | 25 | | | | |
| BLK | 75 | 69 | | 38 | 38 | | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 52 | 50 | 54 | 62 | 44 | 25 | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | 64 | | 52 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 58 | | 57 | 59 | 45 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 52 | 53 | 47 | 56 | 44 | 40 | | | | |

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 | 49 |
| 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 | 63 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 394 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 39 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 36 |
| 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 | 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 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?

There was a significant increase in overall achievement and learning gains for ELA compared to the 2021 data. The only decrease for ELA was a slight decrease in ELA lowest 25th percentile. Math and Science overall achievement showed a slight increase from the 2021 data, and Math learning gains and lowest 25th percentile both showed a significant increase compared to the 2021 data. All subgroups showed improvement in overall ELA and Math achievement, but showed regression in the lowest 25th percentile. All subgroups showed improvement in ELA learning gains except for SWD. All subgroups showed improvement in overall achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25th percentile for Math. All subgroups, except BLK, showed improvement in science achievement.

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

Based on the School Grade Component, our ELA achievement for the lowest 25% did show a slight decrease with our subgroup ELL showing 22% ELA achievement and 43% of ELA LG 25%.

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

- Lack of ELL supports/ strategic scheduling of interpreters
- Lack of strategic planning/ scaffolding within the ELA block

In order to show improvements:

- Provide ELL supports in the ELA block to engage our ELL students
- Training for classroom teachers on ELA supports within Benchmark Advance to scaffold learners
- Strategic use of interpreters to provide instruction within the ELA block, pulling of ELLS in different tiers to provide support and differentiate that support

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

ELA learning gains did show 60% gains of our ELA students.

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

Exposing all students to grade level content while providing scaffolds as necessary. Using rigorous instructional materials in the ELA classroom. Weekly planning with the instructional coach.

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

- Continue exposing students to grade level content while providing temporary scaffolds to support all students.
- Using classroom data to determine instructional next steps.
- Provide multisensory foundational skills to our struggling readers.
- Strategic placement of students during remediation/ enrichment blocks to fill learning gaps and accelerate learning.

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.

- iReady training with iReady consultant two times a year (October and January)
- Three Central Message PDs delivered by the Instructional coach
- PLC's with Instructional Coach
- iReady training for new teachers, presented by Instructional coach
- Intensive, explicit, systematic multisensory training to help support foundational skills in Intermediate grades for remediation purposes.
- Intensive multisensory PD on foundational skills in the primary classroom to help provide strong tier one instruction to primary students.

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

Grade level teams, Instructional Coach, ESOL teacher, Title I Reading teacher will conduct data chats to analyze iReady data and classroom data to create student groups based on academic need for

Remediation/Enrichment block. Teachers will utilize iReady Instructional Grouping Report to create whole group interactive lessons. Thursday tips will be implemented this year for teachers to choose the PD opportunity they wish to attend. Ongoing PD opportunities will be available to address whole group interactive lessons and use of iReady data to help monitor student progress and create lessons.

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 English Language Learners

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | Based on data, our ELL subgroup scored below 41% proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment. |
| Description and Rationale: | According to progress monitoring 1 of FAST, very few of our ELL students showed proficiency. |
| Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | 3rd grade = 0% proficient 4th grade = 6% proficient 5th grade = 8% proficient The results of these assessments indicate that our ELL students are identified as a critical need. |

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

50% of our ELL population will show proficiency on the FAST progress monitoring 3 that will be administered in May.

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

Data chats between administration, classroom teachers, ESOL teacher, and instructional coach will occur each month to monitor student progress. Student samples and classroom assessments will also be used to track progress. iReady data can also be used to compare to classroom data in order to make any necessary adjustments to the personalized path for each student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Jones (jonesl2@okaloosaschools.com)

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

--ESOL teacher will pull out small groups of WIDA Tier A (non-English speakers) to focus on language acquisition.
--Classroom teachers will use evidence based strategies to support ELL's in the classrooms such as:
**gestures
**labeling
**front loading vocabulary (word banks)
**building background knowledge
**strategies such as echoing, asking and answering simple questions,
--Classroom teachers will also conference with individual ELL students to set weekly goals.
--Interpreters will work with ELL's in small groups to provide academic support with grade level content
--Material will be previewed in home language prior to being exposed to it in the English language (using Google translate/interpreter)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Small groups with the ESOL teacher provides targeted lessons/activities to help tailor instruction to meet the needs of the ELLs.
The evidence based strategies listed above are ELL best practices and give access to grade level content for our ELL's.
Interpreters will have the opportunity to help front load vocabulary and pre-read selected texts in native language so that the students can make connections between their native language and the English language.
Classroom teachers can also help with the pre-read strategy by using an iPad with the Google translate app that will translate the passage into the native language.

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.

The use of iReady school-wide creates a personalized learning path for ELL students which allows them to receive instruction and practice in areas of needed support. Diagnostics and results are monitored by administration, ESOL teacher and classroom teachers. Time on task as well as lesson pass rates are also monitored by the classroom teacher.

Person Responsible Lisa Jones (jonesl2@okaloosaschools.com)

The ESOL teacher will work with small groups of ELL students who score in Tier A of the WIDA. The ESOL teacher will use basic prompts, provide visuals, and focus on repetition to help ELL student acquire the English language. Interpreters will work with the ELL students in the classroom setting to pre-read selected texts in the student's native language prior to it being read to them in the English language.

Person Responsible Thuy Nguyen (ngoc-thuy.nguyen@okaloosaschools.com)

The instructional coach will provide professional development opportunities to classroom teachers for strategies in teaching ELL students. Some of the strategies taught would include using gestures, labeling pictures, building background knowledge, and echoing (asking and answering questions). These will be provided to teachers during grade level planning meetings, central message PD, and/or Thursday tips.

Person Responsible Robyn Bailey (baileyr@okaloosaschools.com)

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus | Based on data, our Black/African-American subgroup scored below 41% proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment. |
| Description and Rationale: | According to progress monitoring 1 of FAST, very few of our Black/African-American students showed proficiency. |
| Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | 3rd grade = 33% proficient 4th grade = 0% proficient 5th grade = 22% proficient The results of these assessments indicate that our Black/African-American students are identified as a critical need. |

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

50% of our Black/African-American population will show proficiency on the FAST progress monitoring 3 that will be administered in May.

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

Data chats between administration, classroom teachers, and instructional coach will occur each month to monitor student progress. Classroom assessments as well as iReady data will be used to track progress and make any necessary adjustments to the personalized path for each student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Jones (jonesl2@okaloosaschools.com)

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

Utilizing iReady Tools for Instruction within the Instructional Grouping report teachers will use appropriate text based on student Lexile level to address identified areas of need. Strategies may include:
-use of benchmarks, ALD's, and data should be evident in created lessons
-formative data, such as running records, should be used to create and adjust instructional path
-phonemic awareness/phonics should be included in instruction
-Classroom teachers will conference with individual Black/African-American students to set weekly goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Using iReady Tools for Instruction allows teachers to identify the specific needs of individual students. Formative data will assist the teacher in monitoring growth and focus on academic needs. Phonemic awareness/phonics will provide the foundational skills to increase reading comprehension. Goal setting is a way for the student to see his/her goal and be able to self monitor progress toward that goal.

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.

The use of iReady school-wide creates a personalized learning path for all students which allows them to receive instruction and practice in areas of needed support. The learning path of Black/African-American students will be monitored for sufficient progress. Diagnostics and results are monitored by administration

and classroom teachers. Time on task as well as lesson pass rates are also monitored by the classroom teacher.

Person Responsible Lisa Jones (jonesl2@okaloosaschools.com)

A mentor program will be put in place for identified Black/African-American students. The mentees for this program would be our Guidance Counselor and STP monitor, both of which are Black/African-Americans. Select students will be pulled 10-15 minutes per week for a check in with their mentor. Goals can be set during these pull out sessions, with an incentive for reaching these goals. The time could also be used to help the student with vocabulary or reading strategies.

Person Responsible Joey Chancellor (ernest.chancellor@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

The 2022 iReady data from Diagnostic 3 indicated that 73% 1st grade students and 58% 2nd grade students are not on grade level. 1st and 2nd grades showed that students were a grade level behind in phonological awareness/phonics. 2nd grade data indicated that students are a grade level behind in phonics.

The instructional practice of phonological awareness/phonics was chosen to help build foundational skills.

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

On the 2022 FSA:

3rd grade = 58% below level 3

4th grade = 55% below level 3

5th grade = 59% below level 3

Grades 3 and 4 scored less than 50% proficient in Key Ideas and Details (3rd = 41% proficient; 4th = 44% proficient)
Grade 5 was above 50% but it was still the lowest domain at 51% proficient.

iReady Diagnostic 3 (2022) results correlated well with FSA data:
3rd grade = 59% below proficiency
4th grade = 53% below proficiency
5th grade = 57% below proficiency

The instructional practice of focusing on key ideas and details was chosen to help students build their reading comprehension/understanding of the text.

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)

Based on data, all grade levels show a deficiency in foundational skill (phonological awareness, phonics).

To accelerate learning, 80% of students in grades K-2 will score above the 60th percentile on the iReady Diagnostic 2 in phonological awareness/phonics given in January.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on data, all grade levels show a deficiency in foundational skill (phonological awareness, phonics).

To accelerate learning, 80% of students in grades K-2 will score above the 60th percentile on the iReady Diagnostic 2 in phonological awareness/phonics given in January.

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.

Progress monitoring of the Areas of Focus will be monitored through the following ways:

- MTSS
- Data chats (use of iReady, FAST, classroom data, attendance, discipline to make instructional decisions)
- Literacy Leadership Team (group that discusses data and concerns then creates action plans to address the issues)
- Grade Level meetings (areas of focus are discussed using data in helping make instructional decisions)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jones, Lisa, jonesl2@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?

--Benchmark Advance is the state adopted curriculum. I-Ready is a supplemental program that is evidenced based, with a promising rating.

--Yes, the evidence-based programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan.

--Yes, the evidence-based programs are aligned to the BEST ELA Standards.

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?

--Benchmark Advance is the core curriculum used to teach the BEST Standards. I-Ready is used to remediate/accelerate students based on their specific needs utilizing the Online Personalized Path, Teacher Toolbox, and Phonics for Reading as a Tier 3 Intervention.

--Benchmark Advance is the state adopted curriculum and is aligned to the BEST Standards. Through fidelity of implementation, I-Ready has shown to be effective for the targeted population. This is reinforced by its "promising" evidence-based rating.

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 |
|---|---|
| Professional Development provided by Literacy Coach --specifically on metacognitive skills and best practices for reading instruction delivered to 3-5 ELA teachers to assist in teaching key ideas and details --specifically on foundational skills to include phonological awareness/phonics best practices through multi-sensory strategies for grades K-2 teachers | Bailey, Robyn, baileyr@okaloosaschools.com |
| Literacy Leadership Team This group works collaboratively to analyze school data and determine instructional next steps for all grade levels. | Jones, Lisa, jonesl2@okaloosaschools.com |
| Coaching Cycles with Literacy Coach to ensure best practices are being implemented with a focus on strong Tier 1 instruction with appropriate scaffolds that are being implemented to support all students. | Bailey, Robyn, baileyr@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.

We are in year 4 of PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports). This system is used to improve school safety and promote positive behavior. The focus is on prevention, not punishment. Through PBIS we recognize a student from each class that has exhibited the character trait/phrase throughout the month. Students and teachers are also recognized for academic success following each iReady diagnostic and at the end of the quarter. Systems are also in place for collaboration between teachers, support staff and administration through regularly scheduled leadership meetings, faculty meetings, grade level meetings, and data chats. In addition, the Instructional Coach and Math Coach are available for grade level meetings and professional learning communities.

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

Teachers and staff have been trained in PBIS, and schoolwide expectations are reviewed often through leadership meetings and faculty meetings. The schoolwide expectations are also reviewed each morning through morning announcements. Teachers share schoolwide expectations and the Title I Compact with families during open house and parent conferences throughout the school year. PBIS strategies are discussed during monthly PBIS meetings and are then shared during faculty and grade level meetings. MTSS committee meets weekly to address student behaviors and to collaborate with teachers to develop strategies for reteaching the expectations. Social Committee and PTO (Parent Teacher Organization) both

sponsor 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.