Flagler Schools

Indian Trails Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Indian Trails Middle School

5505 BELLE TERRE PKWY, Palm Coast, FL 32137

www.flaglerschools.com

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.

Flagler School District Mission

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.

Flagler School District Vision

As a courageous, innovative leader in education, Indian Trails Middle School 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, 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
Andrews, Ryan	Principal	School Vision and Accountability
Cronk, Justin	Assistant Principal	Student Services, Math, Operations
Hansen, Katie	Assistant Principal	Community engagement, Science, Assessment
Millette, Tara	Assistant Principal	ELA and ESE
Kaizr, Jeanette	Reading Coach	Supporting instruction and data analysis for ELA and SS

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.

To ensure stakeholder input, Indian Trails brought in a variety of stakeholders to review the data from the spring 2023 assessments, including PM3 FAST for Reading and Math, as well as the Civics and 8th grade Science state assessments. Our instructional team, which consists of administration, instructional

coaches, ESE staff, guidance counselors, and MTSS interventionists, analyzed school-wide data. We also reviewed data with our faculty and staff to get input into our SIP goals. We will also be reviewing our data and goals with our School Advisory Council, which includes parents, community members, and students, at our first SAC meeting for this school year.

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))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through a variety of methods. First, ITMS teachers will participate in weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with a focus on goal setting, data review, and collaboration. Further, the Instructional Leadership Team of ITMS will regularly review data from progress monitoring assessments, including common summative assessments, FAST PM1 and PM2, and quarterly assessments in each content area. As we review the data, we will make the necessary changes to both the plan and the feedback to teachers on instruction to ensure that teachers are supported and coached to improve their practice, as necessary.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	41%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	49	53	142
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	106	106	226
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	104	113	283
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	80	75	238
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	67	86	182

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	12
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	32	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	80	81	218
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	63	61	203
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	32	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	80	81	218
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	63	61	203
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	61	54	49	59	50	50	60		
ELA Learning Gains				53			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			40		
Math Achievement*	63	60	56	74	32	36	65		
Math Learning Gains				67			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			53		
Science Achievement*	67	57	49	63	65	53	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	71	68	80	63	58	73		
Middle School Acceleration	73	63	73	75	54	49	72		
Graduation Rate					52	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	55	55	40	73	70	76	74		

** 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	641
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	34	Yes	4	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	55			
HSP	62			
MUL	65			
PAC				

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%
WHT	71			
FRL	61			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	51			
HSP	65			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	60			

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	61			63			67	75	73			55
SWD	32			34			36	35	33		5	
ELL	47			48			28	56			5	55
AMI												
ASN	74			69			55	62	86		5	
BLK	52			50			44	64	64		5	
HSP	58			57			59	70	77		6	50

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
MUL	53			55			70	80	66		5	
PAC												
WHT	64			68			72	78	73		5	
FRL	54			56			62	65	68		5	

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	59	53	38	74	67	59	63	80	75			73
SWD	23	33	26	38	51	47	21	44	25			
ELL	47	52	44	74	84		33	69	79			73
AMI												
ASN	65	47		85	80		69		100			
BLK	39	44	37	53	59	53	47	68	61			
HSP	59	58	49	72	71	68	55	77	75			
MUL	60	53	27	76	59	58	67	81	77			
PAC												
WHT	62	53	36	77	68	57	67	83	74			
FRL	53	49	39	71	67	62	58	77	67			

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	60	53	40	65	54	53	57	73	72			74
SWD	19	32	33	32	47	48	23	39	38			
ELL	46	65	63	49	63	79	31	68	69			74
AMI												
ASN	70	65		78	52		70	93	92			
BLK	38	34	22	44	35	35	31	56	46			
HSP	53	54	39	56	56	62	51	67	78			
MUL	57	43	9	58	31	25	50	73	80			
PAC												
WHT	64	56	47	71	59	58	64	76	72			

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
FRL	50	46	37	56	51	50	48	66	65			73

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	47%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	47%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	47%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	62%	55%	7%	54%	8%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	45%	-1%	48%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	65%	-6%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	44%	20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	56%	39%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	51%	47%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	71%	1%	66%	6%

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 in the Spring of 2023 was Math, with only 55% of students demonstrating proficiency. Our next lowest component was ELA, with 58% of students deemed proficient. There can be several contributing factors for the low performance including the change in state testing and curriculum or resources for these courses. The ELA performance can possibly be attributed to student stamina. The reading tests were long and required lengthy reading passages.
In 7th grade math specifically, this is the year we pull students into advanced options. We pulled a large majority of the level 3, 4, and 5 students into Algebra, so the remaining students in 7th grade math were previously level 1 and 2's.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 7th grade math, with a 22% decline from 2022. We pulled a large majority of the "proficient" students into Algebra, so the remaining students in 7th grade math were previously level 1 and 2's. We also had several new teachers in this subject/grade level, as well as a position that didn't get filled with a permanent teacher until late in the school year.

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 component that had the greatest gap, when compared to the state, was 7th grade math, which showed a 4% difference. There can be several contributing factors for the low performance including the change in state testing and curriculum or resources for these courses. Again, this can be attributed to removing the proficient students from this test group as well as the fluctuation of staff in this area.

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

ITMS had two components that showed the most improvement: Geometry and Science. Both areas showed a 2% increase from 2022. Geometry students had many opportunities for remediation and support throughout the year. Science focused multiple times per week on historically low-performing clusters of standards, such as Nature of Science. These spiral review opportunities allowed teachers to assess areas of weakness and correct student misconceptions.

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

Based upon our EWS data, ITMS has identified two areas of concern: out of school suspensions and the number of Level 1 students in ELA and Math. In the 2022-2023 year, 226 students had one or more suspensions. We also saw almost 20% of our student population score a Level 1 on ELA and/or Math.

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

Math: 8th grade Pre-Algebra students (last year's 7th grade cohort) increase from 44% to 55% proficient.
Math: Increase overall proficiency from 55% to 62%
ESE: Increase from 38% to 41% proficient and show growth for our students in the LQ
ELA: Increase overall proficiency from 58% to 62%

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 Collaborative Planning

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 data from state assessments, ITMS identified a need to focus on explicit instruction throughout all content areas. While ITMS has maintained data that is above both the district and the state, we recognize a need to focus on high-yield strategies, gradual release methods, and a daily focus on reading, thinking, talking, and writing in every classroom. In order to best support our teachers with the implementation of this goal, we will focus on collaborative planning, empowering our veteran and highly-effective instructional staff to share strategies, ideas, and lessons.

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

Through collaborative planning around explicit instruction, ITMS has set specific benchmark goals within each content area for school-wide proficiency:

English Language Arts: Increase to greater than 62%
Math (not including HS credit classes): Increase to greater than 62%
Civics: Maintain 70% or greater
Science: Maintain 64% or greater

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through progress monitoring assessments, including common summative assessments, district common standards assessments, and FAST PM1 and PM2. Data from these assessments will be reviewed through bi-monthly PLC meetings where teachers can analyze data and develop collaborative plans that are driven by the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Hansen (hansenka@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

Flagler Schools has partnered with SolutionTree to provide high quality and deliberate learning opportunities for teachers through professional learning communities (PLCs). These PLCs are founded on a “focus on student learning”, “building a collaborative culture”, and a “focus on results.” These are achieved with
a shared mission and vision as well as shared values and goals

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

PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. Moreover, PLCs that make data a part of an on-going cycle of instructional improvement, establish a clear vision for schoolwide data use, and provide support that foster a data-driven culture have been shown to promote positive change in student outcomes measures.
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/12
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/blogs/RELMW-ESSA-Tiers-Video-Handout-508.pdf
https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/strategyguide-plcv2

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Develop initial and ongoing professional development supported by instructional coaching on explicit instruction and gradual release strategies.

Person Responsible: Katie Hansen (hansenka@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing throughout the academic year

Teachers will work together in PLC groups to collaborate with curriculum teams to align lesson plans, assessments, and instructional materials with the targeted learning goals in each area, ensuring that explicit instruction and gradual release strategies are integrated into the curriculum design.

Person Responsible: Katie Hansen (hansenka@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing throughout the academic year

Hold regular progress monitoring meetings with teachers to review the effectiveness of their explicit instruction and responsiveness to data

Person Responsible: Katie Hansen (hansenka@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Quarterly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

17 new teachers have been hired for school year 2023-2024 replacing teachers who have left for reasons ranging from: Retirement, New teaching opportunities, or leaving the profession. Orienting large groups of new teachers every school year requires extensive training and impacts school culture. Indian Trails will work to retain teachers.

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

Indian Trails lost twenty percent of its faculty from the 22-23 school year. In addition ITMS had five teachers leave for other employment during the school year. Utilizing CKH strategies ITMS will retain 90% or more of its instructional staff.

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

Teacher retention will be monitored quarterly and a final determination on the percentage of teachers retained will be made by July 1st.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Cronk (cronkj@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) is a set of processes intended to create healthy relationships between adults and youth and to support high-achieving learning environments. It is designed to strengthen students' connection to school by 1) increasing protective factors including positive character development, strong bonds with teachers, and consistently enforced behavioral agreements and 2) decreasing risk factors such as inappropriate behavior and poor social coping skills. Schoolwide implementation of CKH consists of several strategies, collectively referred to as the EXCEL Model strategies, used by K-12 classroom teachers that includes:
greeting students at the door with a handshake
asking students to share good things in their lives
having students create a social contract for expected classroom behavior
posing four questions to redirect behavior
using and encouraging students to use non-verbal hand signals to redirect behavior
ending the class on a powerful note or launch
ITMS faculty & staff will also have the opportunity to build and strengthen relationships among staff, with each other and administration, including back to school bowling social and other social events quarterly.

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

Student resilience and engagement programs, such as CKH, have been shown to have a positive impact on student outcome measures and student/student as well as student/teacher relationship development.

Sources:
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED606969.pdf?scrlybrkr=12e41ab8
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/blogs/RELMW-ESSA-Tiers-Video-Handout-508.pdf

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Reorient faculty and staff to CKH through our back to school faculty meeting where CKH Champions and Admin model strategies

Person Responsible: Justin Cronk (cronkj@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023

Incorporate CKH strategies into monthly faculty meetings

Person Responsible: Justin Cronk (cronkj@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Monthly throughout the year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

It was determined ITMS must increase not only the instructional impact of explicit instruction, but must more effectively implement differentiated instruction, and gradual release based on the following data:

ELA: 58% proficiency
Math for Pre-Algebra students 44% proficiency
Math Overall 55% proficiency
ESE move from 38% proficiency

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

By the end of the academic year, student performance on the FAST progress monitoring 3 assessment will increase in proficiency to the following goals:

ELA: 62% proficiency
Math 8th-grade general education students to 55% proficiency
Math overall to 62% proficiency
SWD to 41% proficiency in both reading and math

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

Teachers will regularly collect and review data from formative and summative assessments, pre and post-assessments, rubric-based evaluations, and classroom observations to analyze and track student progress to determine where instructional adjustments are necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Andrews (andrewsr@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

Explicit instruction and gradual release (I do, You do, We do) will be implemented for this Area of Focus,

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

Explicit instruction is systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented and has been proven to increase academic achievement for underperforming students. Explicit instruction clearly identifies the expectations for learning, highlights important details of the concept or skills, gives precise instructions, models concepts or procedures, and connects new learning to previously learned material.

The "I Do, We Do, You Do" model is based upon the gradual release of responsibility from teacher to student.
This model involves following a series of steps starting with the instructor leading instruction and finishing with students working independently. This evidence-based strategy has proven that students can build their skills and confidence over time by starting with explicit instruction and modeling, moving to guided practice, and finally to independent practice.

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.

Develop initial and ongoing professional development supported by instructional coaching on explicit instruction and gradual release strategies.

Person Responsible: Ryan Andrews (andrewsr@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing throughout the academic year.

Teachers will work together in PLC groups to collaborate with curriculum teams to align lesson plans, assessments, and instructional materials with the targeted learning goals in each area, ensuring that explicit instruction and gradual release strategies are integrated into the curriculum design.

Person Responsible: Ryan Andrews (andrewsr@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing throughout the academic year.

Hold regular progress monitoring meetings with teachers to review the effectiveness of their instruction and gradual release strategies.

Person Responsible: Ryan Andrews (andrewsr@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Quarterly

#4. 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 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.

Increase the proficiency rate of students with disabilities in the area of reading and math for the upcoming academic year.

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

Achieve a proficiency rate of 41% or higher for our students with disabilities in FAST reading and math assessments by the end of the academic year.

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

Collected data from common formative assessments, FAST progress monitoring 1 and progress monitoring 2 will be used to monitor progress toward the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Millette (millettet@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is explicit instruction.

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

Explicit instruction is systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented and has been proven to increase academic achievement for underperforming students. Explicit instruction clearly identifies the expectations for learning, highlights important details of the concept or skills, gives precise instructions, models concepts or procedures, and connects new learning to previously learned material.

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.

Gather and analyze current proficiency data in reading and math to establish a baseline and analyze specific areas of weakness and patterns among students who are not achieving proficiency.

Person Responsible: Tara Millette (millettet@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 18, 2023

Provide professional development for teachers to enhance their knowledge in explicit instruction and incorporate it into instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Tara Millette (millettet@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Throughout the school year

Regular progress monitoring of ongoing common formative assessments and FAST progress monitoring assessments 1 and 2 and analyze the assessment results to adjust instructional strategies and interventions as needed.

Person Responsible: Tara Millette (millettet@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Throughout the school year

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).

At the district level funding and resource allocations are determined through several processes such as staffing plans & position control, comprehensive needs assessments, instructional resource review, and Title I funding.