

Flagler Schools

Old Kings 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

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: 10/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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

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

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	54%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

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
Critcher, Nicole	Principal	The principal is responsible for the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The principal establishes an orderly, safe, and secure school environment.
Ossler, Tara	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal establishes an orderly, safe, and secure school environment.
Scaccia, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal establishes an orderly, safe, and secure school environment.
Newman, Colleen	Instructional Coach	Providing coaching and support for teachers in all core subjects.
Hardesty, Kathryn	Other	Providing coaching and support for teachers in MTSS.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 10/1/2021, Nicole Critcher

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.*

11

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,018

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

13

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	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Tuesday 8/9/2022

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	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	

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 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	

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	73%	61%	56%				72%	63%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						63%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						52%	53%	53%
Math Achievement	79%	49%	50%				73%	66%	63%
Math Learning Gains	75%						64%	62%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						43%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	63%	59%				60%	55%	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	76%	68%	8%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	74%	60%	14%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	58%	7%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

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	77%	72%	5%	62%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	60%	18%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	53%	5%	53%	5%
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	34	33	24	43	41	37	38				
ELL	59	69	50	72	75		58				
ASN	71	63		86	88						
BLK	46	38		57	63						
HSP	71	67	58	75	70	71	70				
MUL	70	59	45	73	80	69	57				
WHT	76	68	49	81	76	70	76				
FRL	68	61	47	73	72	72	73				
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						

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
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				

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	71
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	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
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	67
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	71
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	65
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	71
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	68
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?

Overall ELA Achievement remained at 73%. Learning Gains in ELA dropped 1 point (66%). Our learning gains by students in the Q25 in ELA dropped 17 percentage points. This is the lowest percentage in five years. In the area of Math, our overall Math Achievement increased by 4 points (79%). Learning Gains in Math increased 14 points (75%). This is the highest percentage in five years. Learning gains by students in the Q25 increased 19 points (69%). This is the highest percentage in five years. Science Achievement increased 7 points (73%). This is the highest percentage in five years.

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

Learning gains by students in the lowest quartile for ELA had a significant drop. Students with disabilities, overall, have low or inconsistent performance measures. Their overall percentage was 36%. Students who identify as Black or African American are, overall, performing lower than their non-African American peers.

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

Identifying students specifically in each classroom. Students will be discussed, a plan will be developed, and progress will be tracked during PLCs.

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

Learning gains by students in the lowest quartile for Math is at a five-year high.
Math achievement has been increasing year-over-year.
Science achievement is at a five-year high.

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

Number talks were consistently included in math instruction across the school and monitored by administration.

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

Bi-weekly meetings with ESE team. ESE teachers will participate in weekly grade level PLCs. They will also participate in bi-weekly ESE department meetings with administration. ESE teams will look at aligning upcoming lessons and opportunities for reteach. Instructional practices will be monitored

through teacher walk-throughs, monitoring of accommodations logs, and planning professional learning to support teachers.

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.

Vertical alignment and ESE instructional supports.

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

Our PLC agendas are changing for discussions on instructional delivery in the classrooms to support students with disabilities as well as students receiving Tier 3 intervention. In addition to the high quality instruction provided to all students, students receiving Tier 3 intervention also receive the most intensive supports according to student need. This support is provided in the form of individual team-based problem-solving and increased time for support with a narrowed focus of instruction.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our overall SWD was 36% on-grade level. When we looked further, we reported 34% for ELA achievement, 33% for ELA learning gains, 24% for ELA LQ, 43% for Math achievement, 41% for Math Learning Gains, 37% Math LQ, 38% for Science achievement.

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

Increase percentage of Students with Disabilities performing on grade level from 36% to at least 41%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific SWD look-fors and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impart student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Weekly review of student data and instructional need in PLC's, data chats, and grade level planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Scaccia (scacciak@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Our evidence-based strategy is explicit instruction. We will monitor through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on student learning and determining next steps. Student data will be reviewed weekly. Instruction being delivered the following week will be discussed at weekly grade level PLC's.

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

Rationale for

**Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

**Describe the
resources/
criteria used**

**for selecting
this
strategy.**

Explicit instruction reduces cognitive load for students with LD by segmenting complex skills into smaller tasks, demonstrating and labeling cognitive processes, and providing frequent opportunities for students to receive meaningful, corrective feedback on skills they are practicing (Archer & Hughes, 2011). Segmenting skills into smaller tasks reduces the demand on working memory and supports students with LD in processing new information to solve problems, applying strategies, and completing tasks (Vaughn et al., 2012). When teachers explicitly identify student misconceptions, provide models of how to correctly work through a skill or task, and allow students multiple practice opportunities, students build fluency and automaticity and encode new information into their long-term memory (Martin, 2016).

"Danielson's Framework for Teaching: Convergence and Divergence with Conceptions of Effectiveness in Special Education" Morris-Mathews, Stark, Jones, Brownell, and Bell

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.

Share with faculty and staff the data examined by SLT that determined the need for explicit instruction, weekly review of student data, and grade level planning for upcoming lessons.

Person

Responsible

Kimberly Scaccia (scaccia@flaglerschools.com)

Provide ongoing professional learning in explicit instruction during PLCs and teacher work days.

Person

Responsible

Tara Ossler (ossler@flaglerschools.com)

Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard, the instruction being delivered, teacher questions, and student work.

Person

Responsible

Colleen Newman (newman@flaglerschools.com)

Use targeted intervention in small group by providing individualized instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills.

Person

Responsible

Kathryn Hardesty (hardesty@flaglerschools.com)

Monitor classroom and ESE support facilitation small group instruction/schedules to ensure daily intervention for students with disabilities.

Person

Responsible

Kimberly Scaccia (scaccia@flaglerschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our percentage students who identify as Black/African American performing on grade level was 51%. When we looked further, we reported 46% for ELA achievement, 38% for ELA learning gains, 57% for Math achievement, and 63% for Math Learning Gains. The area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Increase academic achievement in core subject areas for students as identified through state and progress monitoring assessments. This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the

specific

measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve. This

should be a

data based,

objective

outcome.

Increase the percentage of students who identify as Black/African American performing on grade level from 51% to 56%.

Monitoring:

Describe how

this Area of

Focus will be

monitored for

the desired

outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impart student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Weekly review of student data and instructional need in PLC's, data chats, and grade level planning.

Person

responsible for

monitoring

outcome:

Nicole Critcher (critchern@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the

evidence-based

strategy being

implemented

for this Area of

Focus.

Our evidence-based strategy is intensive instruction. We will monitor through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on student learning and determining next steps. Student data will be reviewed weekly. Instruction being delivered the following week will be discussed at weekly grade level PLC's.

Rationale for

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the

rationale for

selecting this

specific

strategy.

Providing instruction in intensive, small groups is associated with positive effects for students with disabilities (Elbaum et al., 1999, 2000) and these small groups result in more frequent opportunities to respond and receive feedback that is specifically attuned to their needs (Doabler et al., 2015). When opportunities to respond and feedback are focused on clear objectives, exposure to distracting, superfluous information is decreased and students are better able to encode new learning into their long-term memory (Martin, 2016).

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

"Danielson's Framework for Teaching: Convergence and Divergence with Conceptions of Effectiveness in Special Education" Morris-Mathews, Stark, Jones, Brownell, and Bell

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.

Share with the entire faculty and staff the data the SLT examined that determined the need of intensive instruction, weekly review of student data, and grade level planning for the upcoming week's lessons.

Person Responsible Nicole Critcher (critchern@flaglerschools.com)

Provide ongoing professional learning in intensive instruction during PLC's, and teacher work days.

Person Responsible Tara Ossler (ossler@flaglerschools.com)

Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard, the instruction being delivered, small group focus, and student work.

Person Responsible Colleen Newman (newmanc@flaglerschools.com)

Use targeted phonics instruction daily for 30 minutes for students with foundational deficits.

Person Responsible Colleen Newman (newmanc@flaglerschools.com)

Use targeted intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills.

Person Responsible Kathryn Hardesty (hardestyk@flaglerschools.com)

Monitor classroom small group instruction/schedules to ensure daily intervention for Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (scaccia@flaglerschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our percentage of students with data in the lower quartile when compared to their peers in the same grade level that made a learning gain (ELA) was 48%. That is an 18% difference between their same grade-level peers who made a learning gain (66%). When we looked further, we reported 39% of 4th grade students with data in the lower quartile made a learning gain (ELA) and 64% of students in the 5th grade with data in the lower quartile made a learning gain (ELA).

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Increase percentage of students identified in our lower quartile who make a learning gain from 48%-54%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impart student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Weekly review of student data and instructional need in PLC's, data chats, and grade level planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Critcher (critchern@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Our evidence-based strategy is intensive instruction. We will monitor through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrators, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on student learning and determining next steps. Student data will be reviewed weekly. Instruction being delivered the following week will be discussed at weekly grade level PLC's.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing instruction in intensive, small groups is associated with positive effects for students with disabilities (Elbaum et al., 1999, 2000) and these small groups result in more frequent opportunities to respond and receive feedback that is specifically attuned to their needs (Doabler et al., 2015). When opportunities to respond and feedback are focused on clear objectives, exposure to distracting, superfluous information is decreased and students are better able to encode new learning into their long-term memory (Martin, 2016).

Describe the

"Danielson's Framework for Teaching: Convergence and Divergence with Conceptions

resources/

criteria used for selecting this strategy. of Effectiveness in Special Education" Morris-Mathews, Stark, Jones, Brownell, and Bell

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.

Share with faculty and staff the data examined by SLT that determined the need for intensive instruction, weekly review of student data, and grade level planning for upcoming instruction.

Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (scaccia@flaglerschools.com)

Provide ongoing professional learning in intensive instruction during PLCs and teacher work days.

Person Responsible Tara Ossler (ossler@flaglerschools.com)

Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard, the instruction being delivered, small group focus, and student work.

Person Responsible Colleen Newman (newman@flaglerschools.com)

Use targeted intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills.

Person Responsible Kathryn Hardesty (hardesty@flaglerschools.com)

Monitor classroom and small group instruction/schedules to ensure daily intervention Q25 students.

Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (scaccia@flaglerschools.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 have made, and continue to make, concentrated efforts to build a positive school culture and environment at Old Kings Elementary School. As a faculty and staff, we have participated in Capturing Kids Hearts, and have built social contracts to guide interactions among faculty, staff, students, families, the community, and all stakeholders. We have prioritized building positive relationships and a supportive environment through team building activities, as well as monthly and quarterly faculty and staff recognitions. We have been intentional as a leadership team, to be visible and available to faculty and staff, and to be thoughtful about the needs of the individuals on our team.

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

Everyone plays a part in creating and maintaining positivity on our campus; however, the school leadership team is the driving force in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Leadership sets the example for faculty and staff in how they will interact with students and one another. Additionally, school leadership is intentional about including community resources to provide support and recognition for the school as well as for faculty and staff.