Old Kings Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Old Kings Elementary School

301 OLD KINGS RD S, Flagler Beach, FL 32136

www.flaglerschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Critcher

Start Date for this Principal: 11/30/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Flagler 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

Old Kings Elementary School

301 OLD KINGS RD S, Flagler Beach, FL 32136

www.flaglerschools.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	45%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Flagler 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.

Flagler County Public Schools ensures educational success through high expectations and innovative thinking in a safe learning environment to empower students to reach their full potential as responsible, ethical, and productive citizens in a diverse and changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a courageous, innovative leader in education, Flagler County Public Schools will be the Nation's premier learning organization where ALL students graduate as socially responsible citizens with the skills necessary to reach their maximum potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crooke, Katherine	Principal	Oversee all operations relating to the function of Old Kings Elementary.
Fries, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Curriculum & Instruction and Exceptional Student Education as well as Student Services and Operations
Chieppa, Toni	Math Coach	Providing coaching and support for teachers in the area of Math and Science.
Hardesty, Kathryn	Instructional Coach	Providing coaching and support for teachers in ELA and MTSS.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 11/30/2018, Nicole Critcher

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,152

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

(Header: Grade Level)

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				72%	63%	57%	65%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	60%	58%	58%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	53%	53%	50%	43%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	66%	63%	73%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	62%	62%	69%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	49%	51%	55%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	55%	53%	60%	56%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	68%	8%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	60%	14%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	58%	7%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	77%	72%	5%	62%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	60%	18%	64%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	53%	5%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready was used as the progress monitoring tool used to compile the data below.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/31%	68/44%	102/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/14%	5/36%	5/45%
	English Language Learners	4/31%	5/38%	2/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25/20%	60/41%	111/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	7/50%	1/7.69%
	English Language Learners	4/31%	6/46%	5/45%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/48%	89/63%	111/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/31%	5/31%	4/25%
	English Language Learners	6/55%	7/64%	5/45%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/30%	68/48%	100/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/12.5%	4/25%	4/25%
	English Language Learners	4/36%	4/36%	6/55%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	98/66%	118/72%	152/91%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7/64%	8/73%	7/64%
	English Language Learners	7/64%	8/73%	5/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/24%	86/53%	120/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/27%	5/45%	4/36%
	English Language Learners	5/45%	7/64%	3/27%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/46%	101/58%	129/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/17%	8/73%	6/26%
	English Language Learners	7/50%	8/57%	4/29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/23%	107/63%	142/78%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/22%	15/65%	1/4%
	English Language Learners	8/57%	11/79%	5/36%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60/43%	88/57%	102/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/14%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	4/33%	5/42%	4/36%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/42%	91/60%	117/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/3%	1/14%	0/2%
	English Language Learners	7/58%	9/75%	6/50%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

	Grade			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	74/46%	105/57%	113/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/2%	14/4	0/2%
	English Language Learners	4/44%	3/33%	3/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	69/43%	114/63%	120/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/16%	4/21%	2/12%
	English Language Learners	0/2%	14/4%	0/2%

Subgroup Data Review

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	43	61	61	42	59	57	19				
ELL	59	75		72	44		60				
ASN	94			88							
BLK	29	36		45	53						
HSP	67	73		75	64		59				
MUL	68	62		66	57						
WHT	75	68	66	76	60	53	68				
FRL	67	61	51	70	54	48	61				
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	32	38	33	29	33	25	25				
ELL	64	57	67	65	72	55					
ASN	81	50		94	91						
BLK	58	50	45	53	46	54					
HSP	55	49	27	64	47	20					
MUL	64	65	58	57	51	29	45				
WHT	76	65	55	76	68	47	61				
FRL	63	56	50	65	60	39	45				

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	38	36	32	46	48	33				
ELL	52	76	70	60	76						
ASN	85	70		100	90						
BLK	51	55		63	68						
HSP	50	57	53	69	74	68	39				
MUL	60	54		70	71	60	62				
WHT	67	58	52	74	68	49	61				
FRL	57	55	51	66	66	55	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

When examining trends we noticed that our cohort data is declining. When reviewing our progress monitoring data for SWD and ELL subgroups, the number of students on grade level decreases from Fall to Spring.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on progress monitoring (i-Ready), we will focus our efforts on SWD & ELL achievement.

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

According to i-Ready, SWD and ELL achievement is low. We will allocate time in our master schedule to ensure targeted, tiered support for these subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off of 2019 state assessment data, ELA achievement went from 65% to 72% (+7).

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

Old Kings implemented standard-aligned instructional routines for core instruction.

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

Old Kings will continue to implement Fundations, Number Talks, and Ready MAFS.

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.

72% of our teachers have received training on instructional routines. Professional Learning for new teachers will take place prior to the start of school and ongoing through PLC. Additionally, modeling will be available for all teachers on instructional routines.

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

Old Kings will allocate resources to support grade bands. Additionally we will design our master schedule to ensure that we are maximizing support and instructional time for tired students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During our year one implementation of instructional routines as identified in our master schedule in 2020-21, we saw an increase in student achievement across content areas. If continued, we hope to maintain and increase in all areas.
Measurable Outcome:	If Old Kings Elementary focuses on implementing standard-aligned, instructional routines with fidelity across content areas, then we will see an increase in student achievement. 3-6 ELA Achievement (from 73% to 74%) 3-6 Math Achievement (from 75% to 76%) 5th Science Achievement (from 65% to 67%)
Monitoring:	The implementation of standard-aligned, instructional routines will be monitored through weekly administrative learning walks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented is standard-aligned, instructional routines.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	". . . While general classroom management routines are often designed to efficiently transition from one learning opportunity to the next, instructional routines are situated inside the learning opportunity itself, providing students with a predictable frame for engaging with the content." Kelemanik, Lucenta, & Janssen Creighton, 2016. Routines for Reasoning: Fostering the Mathematical Practices in All Students. p. 19

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Instructional Leadership Team will create a master schedule that identifies time for instructional routines.
Step 2: Instructional Leadership Team will create a framework for instructional blocks that outlines whole group time, differentiated instruction and iii time.
Step 3: Teachers will be provided with clarifications regarding the rolls of the teacher and the roll of the student during each segment of the instructional block.
Step 4: Academic coaches will provide modeling and coaching for teachers on instructional routines.
Step 5: Support Facilitation will work collaboratively to ensure that classes and students are supported appropriately.
Step 6: Admin will conduct weekly instructional learning walks to gauge the effectiveness of current practice. Step 7: Admin will adjust expectations as needed.

Person Responsible	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During our year one implementation of a master schedule with specific small group time allocated, we saw an increase in our Bottom Quartile Learning Gains across content areas (20-21). In 21-22 we will further clarify the schedule with a breakdown of the instructional reading and math block so that our teachers have a framework to aid them in meeting the needs of all students.
Measurable Outcome:	If Old Kings' Instructional Leadership Team is strategic in outlining a Master Schedule with clarifications for both the ELA and Math instructional block, then we will see in increase in Learning Gains in both content areas. 3-6 ELA Learning Gains (from 67% to 68%) 3-6 Math Learning Gains (from 61% to 64%) 3-6 ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (from 65% to 66%) 3-6 Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (from 50% to 53%)
Monitoring:	Old Kings' Instructional Leadership Team will monitor the adherence of the school-wide Master Schedule through weekly administrative instructional learning walks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy being implemented is standard-aligned, instructional routines as well as small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	". . . While general classroom management routines are often designed to efficiently transition from one learning opportunity to the next, instructional routines are situated inside the learning opportunity itself, providing students with a predictable frame for engaging with the content." Kelemanik, Lucenta, & Janssen Creighton, 2016. Routines for Reasoning: Fostering the Mathematical Practices in All Students. p. 19

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Instructional Leadership Team will create a master schedule that identifies time for instructional routines.
Step 2: Instructional Leadership Team will create a framework for instructional blocks that outlines whole group time, differentiated instruction and iii time.
Step 3: Teachers will be provided with clarifications regarding the rolls of the teacher and the roll of the student during each segment of the instructional block.
Step 4: Academic coaches will provide modeling and coaching for teachers on instructional routines.
Step 5: Support Facilitation will work collaboratively to ensure that classes and students are supported appropriately.
Step 6: Admin will conduct weekly instructional learning walks to gauge the effectiveness of current practice.
Step 7: Admin will adjust expectations as needed.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During our year one implementation of providing intervention that was directly aligned to core instruction, we saw an increase in proficiency among our Students with Disabilities from 31% to 48% (20-21). Additionally we faded 37% of our MTSS students receiving targeted support.
Measurable Outcome:	If Old Kings continues to provide students with interventions aligned to core (Tier 1) instruction and ensures that Tier 3 support is provided outside of whole group instruction, we will see an increase in proficiency among our students with Disabilities from 31% (2019) to 41%.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through weekly administrative learning walks as well as monthly PLC's with ESE support team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidenced-based is the utilization of evidenced-based interventions that are aligned to core instruction. In addition, the implementation of small group instruction outside of whole group (core) instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	" All teachers want their students' achievement levels to increase. Small group instruction and cooperative learning have a significant impact on student achievement." (Hattie, 2009)

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Instructional Leadership Team will rollout 21-22 Instructional Decision Tree relating to tiered interventions.
Step 2: Support Facilitation will administer a baseline assessment to all K-5 ESE/MTSS students in order to identify the area(s) of need and appropriate intervention(s) for each student.
Step 3: Support Facilitation will work collaboratively to ensure that classes and students are supported appropriately.
Step 4: Admin will conduct weekly instructional learning walks to gauge the effectiveness of current practice.
Step 5: Admin will adjust expectations based on feedback and observations as needed.

Person Responsible	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 20-21 Old Kings Student Services Team faded 60% of our students receiving targeted behavior services. These students are now receiving universal support.
Measurable Outcome:	If Old Kings continues to provide individualized MTSS behavior services, we will continue to decrease the percentage of students receiving targeted supports.
Monitoring:	This goal will be monitored through weekly Student Services meetings to determine support for repeated or newly identified students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To provide targeted support for students through the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing targeted support for students, OKES faded 60% of our students receiving targeted behavior services

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Continue to provide Tier 1 classroom and small group lessons
Step 2: School counselors will loop with their grade level.
Step 3: Student Services Team will meet weekly to determine support for repeated or newly identified students.

Person Responsible	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Old Kings decreased the number of Out of School Suspensions from 2018 (32) to 2019 (20). Old Kings will continue to implement PBIS and promote targeted support for at risk students in order to increase the number of students receiving universal supports.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

Old Kings recognizes faculty and staff members monthly. These individuals are nominated by their peers based on our core values. Old Kings hosts various events monthly to promote positive school culture such as PBIS pull day, color wars, Watch Out Style Out Wednesday.

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

As a school we will strive to involve stakeholders in the decision making process by open dialogue and discussion through various parent and community committees established to improve student equality and overall education for all students.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00