Baker School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Baker School

1369 14TH ST, Baker, FL 32531

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mike Martello

Start Date for this Principal: 2/25/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
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)	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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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

Baker School

1369 14TH ST, Baker, FL 32531

[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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	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	10%

School Grades History

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

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.

We inspire a lifelong passion for learning.

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
Hurley, Victoria	Assistant Principal	
Martello, Mike	Principal	
Nixon, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Lay, Tracie	Teacher, K-12	
Capps, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Nunley, Hollie	Teacher, K-12	
Meeks, Amber	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 2/25/2014, Mike Martello

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.*
4

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.*
20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
90

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,475

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
8

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	113	103	109	123	91	100	141	117	111	120	141	118	116	1503
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	20	18	14	19	19	24	21	26	30	29	28	270
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	2	5	7	8	2	3	9	2	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	16	5	11	19	3	5	1	4	2	3	74
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	3	5	10	9	3	2	16	15	17	7	89
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	31	17	26	20	22	24	35	0	196
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	13	23	26	23	17	27	14	32	7	186
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	7	14	31	17	26	20	22	24	35	0	196

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	2	11	17	32	30	31	28	33	29	46	9	268

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	1	4	0	3	1	2	3	4	4	2	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	1	10

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	103	104	123	96	98	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	17	7	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	3	7	10	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	3	2	4	2	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	27	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	6	4	3	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	4	4	10	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	103	104	123	96	98	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	17	7	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	3	7	10	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	3	2	4	2	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	27	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	3	6	4	3	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	4	4	10	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	54%	60%	55%				57%	69%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						53%	63%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						43%	59%	54%
Math Achievement	56%	42%	42%				62%	80%	62%
Math Learning Gains	59%						53%	73%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						43%	64%	52%
Science Achievement	56%	65%	54%				59%	73%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	64%	59%				70%	84%	78%

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	55%	66%	-11%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	67%	-7%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	67%	-4%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2022					
	2019	54%	63%	-9%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
07	2022					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	52%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	66%	-7%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

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	71%	73%	-2%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	74%	74%	0%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	69%	71%	-2%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
06	2022					
	2019	43%	62%	-19%	55%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
07	2022					
	2019	56%	73%	-17%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	65%	-20%	46%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	67%	63%	4%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	51%	67%	-16%	48%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	57%	71%	-14%	67%	-10%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	66%	77%	-11%	71%	-5%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	79%	-6%	70%	3%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	67%	77%	-10%	61%	6%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	73%	-9%	57%	7%

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	27	40	33	32	44	39	36	47		95	21
BLK	36	42		30							
HSP	36			50							
MUL	59	52		74	70		83	70			
WHT	55	53	41	55	59	55	56	69	48	98	53
FRL	47	50	39	49	53	53	47	61	38	97	41
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	28	29	18	30	34	26	32	34		93	23
BLK	47	50		31	50						
MUL	67	68		55	35						
WHT	54	49	30	47	37	31	53	63	60	91	59
FRL	45	42	27	38	35	28	45	52	63	86	55
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	31	40	38	40	42	43	32	53		94	40
BLK	31	31		44	67						
HSP	42	50		50	50			80			
MUL	68	50		57	58		60				
WHT	58	54	45	63	53	41	60	72	68	97	71
FRL	48	52	44	55	50	40	53	61	56	94	59

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	645
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	43
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	68
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	58
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

ELA 55% proficiency was maintained from previous year. ELA made a 3% increase in learning gains with a 11% increase amongst the 25th percentile. Math proficiency increased 9%, with a 22% increase in learning gains. Science proficiency increased 4% and social studies increased 7%.

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

School wide the greatest need for improvement is with our ELA content and more specifically our Black Subgroup. ELA as a whole maintained the same level of proficiency as the previous year. we did show a small increase in learning gains with the greatest gains coming from the lowest 25th percentile group.

We are did not show an increase in learning gains amongst our proficient and about grade level students. Our Black students performed the lowest among our sub groups in ELA. This is the first year we have seen this decline.

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

ELA achievement within our Black Subgroup showed a significant learning loss of 11%. The ELA Black learning gains was also down by 8%. Math achievement is down 1%.

The Multiracial Subgroup is the highest performing of our subgroups but they are down in ELA by 8% from previous year. The ELA learning gains is down 16%.

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

We saw a 11% increase in ELA learning gains with SWD with a 15% increase among the lowest 25%. There was a 13% increase in Math learning gains with SWD and with in the lowest 25% of SWD.

White students make slight increase in ELA in achievement as well as learning gains. The lowest 25% of White ELA students made the greatest increase at 11%.

FRL students showed an overall 2% increase in achievement in ELA. The FRL ELA learning gains increased by 8% with and a 12% increase among the lowest 25%.

The Multiracial subgroup increased 19% on Math Achievement with a 35% increase in Learning Gains.

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

We had a mid year push to provide in school and after school tutoring. This allowed students to learn/ practice in small groups or one-on-one both at their independent level or instructional level depending on the need. We implemented the newly adopted textbook resources that target students needs.

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

We have been working to close the achievement gap by utilizing higher quality instructional materials that align with the benchmarks as well as increasing the amount of teachers/tutors to work with students one-on-one and in small groups. We are providing parent nights where parents can receive training and take home resources. We are reviewing individual data and placing mentors/tutors with secondary students who may be showing regression.

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.

Teachers are receiving training on newly state adopted textbooks as well as release time to plan and collaborate with grade level. Teachers are receiving training on BEST standards through workshops and daily Instructional Coach Support.

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

Teachers will continue to receive training and students will access iReady curriculum/data. Administration will continue to support teacher at various experience levels with professional

development, data analysis, instructional coach support, peer mentors and common planning time. Students will have options for during school, after school hours and zoom tutoring. Baker instructional staff will continue offering parent workshops to help parents/students with transitions, academic support, career and technical training preparedness/planning.

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 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.	The identified students struggle to reach grade level proficiency on previous years FSA assessment. The previous year's performance is a 36% on the Federal Points Index. Anything below a 41% is an indication of a critical need. This is the first year this subgroup has been identified as an ESSA focus group.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Of the identified students 62% will score a level 3 or higher on the end of the year F.A.S.T. Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom Teacher and administration will monitor students progress quarterly through data chats. The data used to track students will include Benchmark Assessments, iReady Diagnostic, F.A.S.T. assessment, and teacher observation. Administrators will monitor best practices through walk-throughs and formal/ informal observations. The Literacy team will also review progress and make school wide suggestions for improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mike Martello (martellom@okaloosaschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Deliver instruction that fosters student engagement via meaningful interactions with texts utilizing approved resources to include Benchmark Advance and i-Ready to develop lessons and tasks that promote comprehension and analysis of complex texts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Benchmark Advanced curriculum features culturally responsive instruction and equitable resources, engendering a sense of community through reflective dialogue as they expand knowledge. Diverse authors and illustrators share authentic stories that reflect students' own experiences and broaden their perspectives. Accessibility tools, multimodal learning opportunities, embedded differentiation, and targeted intervention scaffold instruction.

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.

Three professional development days were focused on improving the use of Benchmark Advanced curriculum and the embedded supplemental materials more efficiently in class. Teachers were able to explore and analyze the mini lessons for scaffolding all ready embedded in the core curriculum.

Admin conducts walk throughs to monitor that Benchmark Advanced curriculum is being used.

Instructional Coach has modeled lessons in classrooms using Benchmark Advanced and has taken teachers to observe our model classroom.

Person Responsible Victoria Hurley (hurleyv@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

Implement a strong focus on multi-sensory systematic foundational learning to support comprehension and analysis of grade level appropriate complex texts found in Benchmark Advance and iReady: oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, and fluency.

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

Purposefully integrate the six B.E.S.T. ELA Expectations into standards-based lessons and tasks. Cite evidence to explain and justify reasoning. Read and comprehend grade-level complex texts proficiently. Make inferences to support comprehension. Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations. Use the accepted rules governing a specific format to create quality work.
Use appropriate voice and tone when speaking or writing.

Deliver instruction that fosters student engagement via meaningful interactions with text(s) utilizing approved resources to include Benchmark Advance and i-Ready to develop lessons and tasks that promote comprehension and analysis of complex text(s).

Implement the gradual release framework within whole group and small group instruction.
I do (teacher modeling), We do (teacher/student collaboration), You do it together (student collaboration

with teacher assistance, as needed), You do it alone (student demonstrates skill/concept independently)

Strategically integrate the components of close reading that lead to a culminating task using grade level complex text(s) to include purposeful text-dependent questions, text-marking, annotating, writing through reading, and student talk.

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)

In the spring of 2022, iReady data indicated that our Kindergarten was exceeding the district average. 97% of our students scored proficient, which exceeded the district by 8%. There is some summer regression because the same students scored 7% below the district on the beginning of the year iReady. Our goal for this school year is to maintain the 97% proficiency.

1st grade end of the diagnostic for Baker School(63%) was in line with the district(62%). This cohort also showed some regression on the beginning of the year data which placed us 7% behind the district in proficiency. Our goal is to increase average student proficiency to 67%.

2nd grade end of the year data reflected 62% proficient which was below the district average of 66%. This cohort also scored 7% below the district average on beginning of the year baseline testing. Our goal is to increase average student proficiency to 67%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In the spring of 2022, FSA data indicated that our 3rd Grade was below the district average. 50% of our students scored proficient, which was 8% below the district average. There was some summer regression in the incoming cohort which scored 7% below the district on the beginning of the year iReady. Our goal for this school year is to meet or exceed the district average with an increase of 8%.

4th grade end of the year FSA for Baker School scored 47% proficiency. The incoming cohort also showed some increase on the beginning of the year data which placed us 4% behind the district in proficiency. Our goal is to increase average student proficiency to 62%.

5th grade end of the year data reflected 60% proficient which was below the district average of 62%. The incoming cohort also scored 4% below the district average on beginning of the year baseline testing. Our goal is to increase average student proficiency to 67%.

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.

Classroom Teacher and administration will monitor students progress quarterly through data chats. The data used to track students will include Benchmark Assessments, iReady Diagnostic, F.A.S.T. assessment, and teacher observation. Administrators will monitor best practices through walk-throughs and formal/ informal observations. The Literacy team will also review progress and make school wide suggestions for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Martello, Mike, martellom@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?

Data-driven instructional plans and practice reflect the use of district approved resources to include Benchmark Advance, pacing guides, and B.E.S.T. Benchmark Booklet.

Utilize instructional engagement strategies for effective, engaging reading instruction.

Pre-reading strategies to include journaling, activating prior knowledge, essential questions, preview a text, identifying/ labeling text features, and making predictions.

Foundation skills such oral language, phonemic awareness, phonics, high frequency words, and fluency using multi-sensory instructional strategies.

Pre-teach vocabulary

Whole and small-group interactive student talk (eg, Go-Go-Mo, Turn and Talk / Think-Pair-Share, Slides, Socratic Seminar)

Text-Dependent Questions at the appropriate DOK level with intentional focus and purpose

Utilize close reading strategies to include making connections, questioning, visualizing, text marking, annotating, citing text evidence, and graphic organizers.

Small group and cooperative group learning utilizing Benchmark Advance resources.

Gradual Release Framework (I do, we do, you do it together, and you do it alone)

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?

Florida Benchmark Advanced program is aligned to the science of reading research. It is designed to reflect current and confirmed research on learning to read and teaching reading. It maximizes the potential of every student by building knowledge across grade level, as well as providing the resources to scaffold and teach students at their independent level.

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
Our Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to team review student data and School Performance Plan goals. Action plans are developed for any areas of concern. The Literacy Coach is on campus four days a week providing training through coaching rounds with individual teachers. The Coach is also leading a book study. All students participate in formative and summative testing. Admin, teachers, and instructional coaches conduct data chats for the purposes of identifying services need for students and professional development opportunities for teachers. Teachers will attend two iReady trainings during the year. The focus of the training is to understand and analyze the diagnostic data to plan for remediation or acceleration through iReady. Teachers will have three professional training days to focus on interactive whole group instruction.	Hurley, Victoria, hurleyv@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.

Baker School is striving to reach Academic Excellence through an emphasis on standards/ benchmark focused instruction. Last year we earned the grade of B from the Florida Department of Education which proved an increase in instruction as many of our classes showed significant learning gains. With a growing focus on understanding instructional benchmarks specific to each grade level, utilizing subject pacing guides, collaborative planning and data analysis students are expected to earn the highest possible rating of an "A" for next school year.

Continuous Learning is emphasized both within the faculty and among the students. Teachers are a part of OCSD professional development as well as training outside of the district. Maintaining teachers depth of knowledge is key to impacting our student performance. Students are encouraged to not just meet grade level expectations but to exceed them. There is an enrichment focus in all elementary classes as well as opportunities for middle and high school students who seek advanced course work.

All instructional decisions should be Student Focused. Many of our students have faced unprecedented challenges over the past few years and Baker School has matched those challenges with a network of support. During the second semester of the 2022 school year we increased tutoring for Middle and High School students and began an in-school tutoring program for elementary students. This year we will begin services for students in September and add as student needs arise.

School safety is a top priority at Baker School and we work closely with our school safety team and OCSO SRO team to create a campus where students feel safe to learn and grow. Middle and High School students are seen wearing badges that allow them access through the manned gates during intake and then through a single point of entry thereafter. These badges have the suicide prevention hotline number printed on them as we continue our efforts to increase mental health awareness. The 2022 was the first school year that Baker School had a yearlong active HOPE Squad. This peer support program has been expanded throughout elementary, middle and high school. We also have increased counseling services to five days a week so that there is always someone available to support students and staff.

Modern Innovation is key for preparing the work force of tomorrow. Middle and High school students have the opportunity to begin earning industry-based certifications in STEM focused areas as well as utilizing tools that are necessary tools in an evolving climate. Last year Middle and High School Math and Science classes began utilizing tablets and Touch Skin TVs to support learning and all elementary students were issued a 1 to 1 device. Last school year elementary students third through fifth grade were invited to participate in an extended day after school Coding program. We will continue and expand this in the coming school year. Baker School has begun placing touch screen TVs in elementary classrooms and has budgeted to increase hands on science materials for labs and exploration.

Baker School is the largest employer in our school zone, and it is the heart of the community. An invitation to be a part of our family has been emphasized through our volunteer program, Title 1 family engagement activities, sporting events, and SAC Committee efforts. This year we are expanding our community partnership to include a PTA.

Along with PBIS, we have implemented a student of the month and a faculty member of the month. Nominations come from each peer group and we draw names to determine who will be recognized.

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

All teachers are part of the process of developing our School Performance Plan. Teachers give feedback throughout the spring/summer and then opportunities to review and revise at the start of the the school year. In addition we have established to two teacher leader groups, Literacy Leadership Council and Grade Level/Department Heads which helps to monitor our schools progress as well as model during professional development. Baker School has an active School Advisor Council which provides opportunities to contribute to the development of this plan, monitors and demonstrates progress in meeting the school improvement goals and objectives. Administration is visible on campus and participates in all professional development and development of the SPP. Admin, along with Dean of Students, Elizabeth Richards are on the second year of implementing a school wide PBIS system. We have daily participation in the program and ongoing progress monitoring including admin, teachers and community members.