Prek/Kindergarten Center School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Prek/Kindergarten Center

362 SOUTH BLVD E, Macclenny, FL 32063

www.bakerk12.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Baker County School Board on 9/18/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Baker County Pre-K/Kindergarten Center's mission statement is to provide a Quali'T.E.A.' education-Transforming teaching and learning experiences, providing engaging opportunities and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The mission of the Baker County Pre-K/Kindergarten Center is to prepare a garden of children where growing and learning begins.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Bonnie	Principal	Principal: Leads the faculty, staff and students on the vision and mission of the school. Head of administration team within the school and is responsible for daily operations of the institution. She oversees the development of curriculum, and enforces school policies relating to discipline and safety. Sets goals and ensures students are meeting their objectives. Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures that the interventions are implemented with fidelity; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Craven, Morgan	School Counselor	School Counselor includes facilitating individual educational plan (I.E.P. meetings), Multi-tiered systems of support (M.T.S.S) brainstorming interventions based on student data that can be implemented to correct the deficiencies or add enrichment for their students. Acts as a liaison between classroom teachers and Multi-Tiered System of Support team, collecting data and other pertinent information for struggling students. She finds best practices and ways to guide instruction for her team. She holds weekly meetings to keep her team up to date on events and activities at the school. She attends monthly team leader meetings to discuss data and student growth. She takes on leadership projects throughout the year.
Faulkner, Kimber	Administrative Support	Coordinate the use of school facilities for day to day activities and events. Create schedules for events and day to day activities. Provides information about core curriculum and instruction; provides support for the roles of the MTSS team; gathers data on discipline; researches strategies, intervention and facilitates their implementation; assists the Principal in ensuring interventions and strategies are implemented with fidelity.
Hand, Deedee	Other	ESE Support/Facilitator assists with brainstorming interventions based on student data that can be implemented to correct the deficiencies or add enrichment for their students, meet individual education plan goals, writes I.E.P. goals. Acts as a liaison between classroom teachers and Multi Tiered System of Support team, collecting data and other pertinent information for struggling students. She finds best practices and ways to guide instruction for her team. She holds weekly meetings to keep her team up to date on events and activities at the school. She attends monthly team leader meetings to discuss data and student growth. She takes on leadership projects throughout the year.
Rowan, Tanyia	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		intervention services for children to be considered "at-risk", assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.
Jones, Alia	SAC Member	The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a school-based group intended to represent the school, the community, and those persons closest to the students. The group shares responsibility for guiding the school toward continuous improvement. The SAC committee will hold approximately 6 formal meetings throughout the school year at various times of the day to accommodate members' schedules.
Wall, Molly	SAC Member	The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a school-based group intended to represent the school, the community, and those persons closest to the students. The group shares responsibility for guiding the school toward continuous improvement. The SAC committee will hold approximately 6 formal meetings throughout the school year at various times of the day to accommodate members' schedules.
Nettles, Lisa	SAC Member	The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a school-based group intended to represent the school, the community, and those persons closest to the students. The group shares responsibility for guiding the school toward continuous improvement. The SAC committee will hold approximately 6 formal meetings throughout the school year at various times of the day to accommodate members' schedules.
Padgett, Lucretia	SAC Member	The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a school-based group intended to represent the school, the community, and those persons closest to the students. The group shares responsibility for guiding the school toward continuous improvement. The SAC committee will hold approximately 6 formal meetings throughout the school year at various times of the day to accommodate members' schedules.
Green, Chariot	SAC Member	The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a school-based group intended to represent the school, the community, and those persons closest to the students. The group shares responsibility for guiding the school toward continuous improvement. The SAC committee will hold approximately 6 formal meetings throughout the school year at various times of the day to accommodate members' schedules.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Officers were elected at the initial school advisory council meeting on August 17, 2023. All stakeholders were made aware of pre-k and kindergarten students' academic and discipline data. The results of faculty/staff surveys and parent surveys were shared. Input from all stakeholders was welcomed and shared in creating specific, measurable goals, creating a vision and mission, and follow up problem solving sessions for the for 2023-2024 school year. Upcoming events and opportunities to serve our school will be discussed during the next School Advisory Committee meeting on September 28, 2023.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Baker County Pre-K/Kindergarten Center's pre-k and kindergarten students' social emotional learning and academic progress is closely monitored, analyzed, and disaggregated to look for trends and patterns in order to provide interventions or enrichment. The school improvement plan's goals and the progress of attaining those goals will be reviewed by students' teachers and referenced during quarterly data chats, bi-weekly professional learning community meetings, monthly multi tiered systems of support (M.T.S.S) meetings, and monthly positive behavior intervention support team meetings. Our progress including successes and opportunities for growth will be shared with stakeholders.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-KG
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	19%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	390	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	51	53	70	55	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				80					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	82	53	59	76	31	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				80					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		32	54		60	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					48	64			
Middle School Acceleration					34	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress			59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	216
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	306
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	57			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP				
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	75			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	61			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	66			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	67			82								
SWD	51			66							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			73							3	
HSP												
MUL	55			82							3	

	2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	72			82							3	
FRL	64			80							3	

	2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	80		76	80							
SWD	52			70								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			60								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77			78								
FRL	64			68								

	2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71			72								
SWD	59			68								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51			50								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75			77								
FRL	62			61								

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was evident on the FAST: STAR Early Literacy on PM 3 in Phonemic awareness: structural analysis, a student's ability to understand the structure of words and word parts, such as finding words, adding beginning or ending letters or syllables to a word, building words, and identifying compound words.
Professional learning of the Tier 1 Instruction, deeper understanding and application of BEST ELA and Math standards, and the science of reading-scientifically based research abut reading issues related to reading and writing, will be the focus of our school this school year and next. We do have many new teachers (<3 years) which include non education majors. This training will increase teacher knowledge and the quality of literacy instruction strategies and student engagement in literacy learning.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The percentage of Kindergarten students who scored in the 50th percentile or higher went from 64% in 2021-2022 school year to 48.35% in 2022-2023 school on STAR Early Literacy PM3. Although our school has been administering the STAR Early Literacy for several years, FAST Star Early Literacy has become the required state wide progress monitoring per Fl statute 1008.25(8). In the past, we have administered the STAR Early Literacy Progress Monitoring 4 times throughout the year. Last year, we progress monitored 3 times. Therefore, comparing 21-22 scores to 22-23 scores may not have been comparing "apples to apples" Historically, the 50th percentile has been the score we have been using to determine if a student was on grade level. We will be learning more about cut scores, how to read the data reports and understand the STAR data to differentiate instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The state has not released state averages for Star Early Literacy for the 2022-2023 school year.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The number of kindergarten students receiving a failing grade in English Language Arts went from 113 in the first 4 weeks of school (September 21, 2022) to 27 students in the last 4 weeks of school (April 14, 2023) or from 30% to 7% . Multi Tiered systems of support, small group differentiated instruction from students' teacher, daily "Kindervention" in the classroom, push in support from our instructional coach, quarterly data chats with the leadership team, parent conferences, communication to parents regarding student progress, data analysis of weekly progress monitoring, and student knowledge and

accountability for their progress could be attributed to only 70% of Kindergartners passing Kindergarten to 93% of students passing Kindergarten.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The number of students that missed 10% or more of school was 134 in '21-'22 and increased to 153 in '22-'23. The number of students that had 2 or more EWS went from 23 students in '21-'22 to 37 students in '22-'23. Absences and 2 or more EWS are two potential areas of concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Increase achievement and student engagement
Increase effective efficacy and motivation of teachers through professional learning in Tier 1 Instruction
Develop an innovative model for professional learning, collaboration and support in the Science of reading, Tier 1 Instruction
Increase attendance by educating all stakeholders about its importance and increasing student engagement
Continue to increase student social emotional learning success

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

By partnering with Northeast Florida Education Consortium's Rural Connect, a sustainable plan for the implementation of the science of reading literacy strategies based on B.E.S.T. standards for all kindergarten teachers will be developed for the 2024-2025 school year. The cadre of teachers who will participate in the 23/24 professional learning community will Increase collective efficacy and motivation of Baker County Pre-K/Kindergarten Center's teachers. Professional learning from the Baker County School District wide Tier 1 instruction will include all K-12 teachers.

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

At PM3, 70% of Kindergarten students will score at or above benchmark (40PR)

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

Three rounds of classroom observation (August/September, October, and November to January) for content and practice from the Rural Connect professional learning community will be conducted by the principal, feedback will be given to teachers and submitted to NEFEC for analysis and differentiation of professional learning. The cadres (teachers, coaches and administrators) will attend three trainings to build capacity. Monitoring of rural connect participants' classrooms looking for quality science of reading strategies will be conducted from February 1, 2024 until May 2024. A showcase of best practices will take place in April 2024. Science of reading connected support resources will be incorporated in the sustainable 2024/2025 plan for school wide implementation. Baker County School District Tier 1 Professional Learning will take place throughout the school year on early out days, planning days, and "Friday Focus" sessions. Dr. Rowan, our instructional coach, will deliver these professional development sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Bonnie Jones (bonnie.jones@bakerk12.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Provide strategies for content area literacy instruction and promoting student engagement in literacy learning. Support teacher self direction and empowerment through personalized professional learning, teacher leadership and feedback. Train job embedded coaches and educational leaders. Strengthen classroom implementation through feedback, reflective practice, and use of data for planning and driving instruction. Support consistency and fidelity of implementation of B.E.S.T. standards and science of reading high yield practices across our school. This training will facilate sustainability, replication and expansion.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many of our teachers have been teaching for 3 years or less, did not major in education and did not take early childhood/elementary education classes nor intern. The rationale for selecting this strategy is to increase achievement and literacy engagement of high need students, increase collective efficacy and motivation of our teachers and refine an innovative model for professional learning, collaboration and support. This will also motivate teachers, as school and district wide educators will be using the same

academic language, learn evidence based strategies that will be implemented, monitored and reflected upon.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Baker County Pre-K/Kindergarten Center's discipline equality gaps between genders. Thirteen males received 22 discipline referrals. Two females received 3 discipline referrals. Out of a total of 25 discipline referrals given in the 22-23 school year, 88% were given to males, and 12% given to females.

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

Goal: To equalize the percentage of discipline referrals to males and females or 50/50.

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

Positive Behavior Intervention Support Monthly meetings to review data, plan interventions, and implementation action plans. Following implementation of the plan, reflection and evaluation of the results are conducted.
M.T.S.S. Tier 1, 2 and 3 monthly meetings
Weekly Trauma Informed Teaching through resource class (Kinder Kittens)
Social Emotional Small Group Instruction based on need-twice a week
Create a diverse team of community members willing to mentor, support, encourage, and work with our students-Volunteer Love-Quarterly meetings
Class Room Walk Throughs-EREL-to gauge student engagement and provide feedback to teachers to increase student engagement and the quality of the instruction (best high yield instructional practices)
Positive Reinforcement for Following PBIS Expectations quarterly
Monthly PBIS Events and Daily PBIS Rewards
Professional Learning on Classroom Management and Professional Development Follow Up
Florida Resiliency Tool Kit Action Plan-monthly activities

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Create a diverse team of community members/volunteers willing to mentor, support, encourage and work with students
Volunteer Love Program
Positive Behavior Intervention Support Team-Meets monthly to analyze data and implements new ways to decrease the behaviors of the diverse student population
Multi tiered systems of support-problem solving Tier 1, 2,3
Trauma informed teaching
Dads Rock: Engagement Toolkit (FLDOE)
Dads Take Your Child To School Day
Once a Month 'Man'ic Mondays-Male Role Models and Community Leaders Present on Campus at Arrival, throughout the day, and dismissal
Florida Resiliency Tool Kit (FLDOE)
Family Involvement Activities Throughout the School Year

Professional Learning on Tier 1 Instruction, High Student Engagement, Resiliency
Social Emotional Learning (TEACH TOWN, Sanford Harmony Curriculum)
Hands On Learning
Interactive Boards
S.T.E.M. Activities

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to close the gender gap in our discipline data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PBIS Monthly Team Meetings to analyze and disaggregate discipline data.

Person Responsible: Kimber Faulkner (kimber.faulkner@bakerk12.org)

By When: monthly

Weekly Classroom walkthroughs using the EREL to gauge student engagement and instruction with feedback to teachers for continuous improvement

Person Responsible: Bonnie Jones (bonnie.jones@bakerk12.org)

By When: weekly

Develop and Coordinate a Community Member Group to mentor students

Person Responsible: Alia Jones (alia.jones@bakerk12.org)

By When: September 28, 2023

Multi Tiered Systems of Support Tier 1,2, and 3 Meetings

Person Responsible: Morgan Craven (morgan.craven@bakerk12.org)

By When: monthly and as needed

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).