Old Kings Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Old Kings Elementary School

301 OLD KINGS RD S, Flagler Beach, FL 32136

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Critcher, Nicole	Principal	The principal is responsible for the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The principal establishes an orderly, safe, and secure school environment.
Ossler, Tara	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic performance and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional practices taking place within classrooms, developing follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal monitors the positive culture and environment of the school and develops a plan to maintain a positive, safe, and secure school environment.
Scaccia, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic performance and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional practices taking place within classrooms, developing follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal monitors the positive culture and environment of the school and develops a plan to maintain a positive, safe, and secure school environment.
Newman, Colleen	Instructional Coach	Providing coaching and support for teachers in the area of literacy.
Schultz, Linda	Instructional Coach	Providing coaching and support for teachers in the areas of math and science.
Hardesty, Kathryn	Other	Providing coaching and support for teachers in MTSS.

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.

Old Kings Elementary continually involves all stakeholders (school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, and community members) through monthly review of current data to support the School Improvement Plan Areas of Focus. Areas of Focus will be reviewed as part of the monthly agenda for all stakeholder groups. These monthly reviews are done via PLCs, School Advisory Council, and Parent Teacher Organizations. Opportunity for stakeholder feedback will be provided and all input will be used

to monitor the effectiveness of the action steps utilized to meet the measurable goals established in the SIP.

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))

Students will take local and state diagnostic assessments. Data from these assessments will be reviewed with all stakeholders. Areas of Focus will be revisited continually with all stakeholder groups via PLCs, School Advisory Council, and Parent Teacher Organization meetings to monitor the effectiveness of the action steps provided to meet the measurable goals established in the SIP. Revisions to the plan based on data collected, as well as stakeholder input, will be shared to all stakeholders. Stakeholders will access the the updated SIP on our school website. Paper copies can be requested through the front office.

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-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	11	27	18	26	16	17	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	35	16	19	29	20	0	0	0	120
Course failure in Math	1	30	8	13	33	19	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	35	22	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	23	30	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	6	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	3	3	2	1	12	5	0	0	0	26

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	3	3	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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.	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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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.	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
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*	67	56	53	73	61	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				66			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			65		
Math Achievement*	75	61	59	79	49	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				75			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			50		
Science Achievement*	75	60	54	73	63	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	70	69	59	85			64		

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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	43			
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	52			
HSP	76			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	76			

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	67			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	51			
HSP	71			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	68			

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			75			75					70
SWD	31			35			23				4	
ELL	50			71							4	70
AMI												
ASN	58			92							2	
BLK	47			57							2	
HSP	66			72		77					4	
MUL	67			60							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	69			77			79				4	
FRL	58			65			69				5	73

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	73	66	48	79	75	69	73					85
SWD	34	33	24	43	41	37	38					
ELL	59	69	50	72	75		58					85
AMI												
ASN	71	63		86	88							
BLK	46	38		57	63							
HSP	71	67	58	75	70	71	70					83
MUL	70	59	45	73	80	69	57					
PAC												
WHT	76	68	49	81	76	70	76					
FRL	68	61	47	73	72	72	73					79

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	73	67	65	75	61	50	66					64
SWD	43	61	61	42	59	57	19					
ELL	59	75		72	44		60					64
AMI												
ASN	94			88								
BLK	29	36		45	53							
HSP	67	73		75	64		59					
MUL	68	62		66	57							
PAC												
WHT	75	68	66	76	60	53	68					67
FRL	67	61	51	70	54	48	61					64

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
05	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	57%	20%	50%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	78%	64%	14%	59%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	62%	18%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	57%	16%	51%	22%

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.

Students with disabilities, overall, have low or inconsistent performance measures. The overall percentage of students in this category meeting proficiency in ELA was 33.3%, Math was 37.5%, and Science was 26.7%. In total, overall combined proficiency of students with disabilities was 34.5%, which was a decrease of 6 points from the previous year. However, this was an 8 point increase over the same category in 2019. The years of 2021 and 2022 reached the highest percentages in a 5 year period with an average of 41.65%. We have identified the need for improvement in the area of explicit instruction based on learning gaps identified through frequent data collection and provided in consistent small group instruction.

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 2022 was ELA Grade 5. This area had a decline of 14 points. We have identified the need for improvement in the area of explicit instruction based on learning gaps identified through frequent data collection and provided daily through small group 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.

Overall, Old Kings performed significantly higher than the state average in all components. Grade 3 ELA had the greatest gap with a positive difference of 27 points. Teachers in this grade level implemented an intervention model that grouped students based on identified needs and provided specific instruction to close learning gaps. Third grade bootcamp was also implemented prior to state testing.

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

Grade 3 ELA reported the greatest improvement with an increase of 8 points. At the mid-year review, teachers in this grade level identified the need to provide specific instruction to targeted groups of students. Students received this intervention daily in a small groups with instruction provided by a certified teacher. Those students with the most significant learning gaps received this targeted instruction in addition to their support identified on the Tier 3 plan or IEP.

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

The area of greatest concern as reported by our EWS is in the area of attendance.

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

1. Overall proficiency of Students with Disabilities in ELA
2. Overall proficiency of Students with Disabilities in Math
3. Proficiency of Students with Disabilities in Science
4. ELA achievement across grades 3-5.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our overall SWD was 34% on-grade level. When we looked further, we reported 33.3% for ELA achievement, 37.5% for Math achievement, and 26% for Science achievement.

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

Increase percentage of Students with Disabilities performing on grade level from 34% to 42%.

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

Students will take fall and winter diagnostics in ELA and Mathematics. Results from these tests will help determine which students need interventions if they are below "early" grade level in the Fall and below "mid" grade level in the winter. These diagnostics have been shown to have a high correlation with other state-based student achievement metrics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Scaccia (scacciak@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.)

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

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

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

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.

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

Person Responsible: Kimberly Scaccia (scacciak@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Data will be reviewed by the end of the first quarter.

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

Person Responsible: Tara Ossler (osslert@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Professional learning in explicit instruction will be provided by the end of the second quarter.

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

Person Responsible: Colleen Newman (newmanc@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and continuing until the end of the school year.

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

Person Responsible: Kathryn Hardesty (hardestyk@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and continuing throughout the school year.

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

Person Responsible: Kimberly Scaccia (scacciak@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and continuing throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. Results of our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our overall percentage of students scoring at proficiency or above in ELA was 68%. Looking further, the percentage of students in Grade 3 was 77% (8 points above 21-22), Grade 4 was 62% (9 points below 21-22), and Grade 5 was 63% (14 points below 21-22).

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

Increase percentage of students scoring at proficiency or above in ELA to 70%.

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

Students will take a fall and winter diagnostic in ELA. Results from these tests will help determine which students need interventions if they are below "early" grade level in the Fall and below "mid" grade level in the winter. These diagnostics have been shown to have a high correlation with other state-based student achievement metrics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Critcher (critchern@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 reduces cognitive load for students by segmenting complex skills into smaller tasks, demonstrating and labeling cognitive processes, and providing frequent opportunities for students to receive meaningful, corrective feedback on skills they are practicing (Archer & Hughes, 2011). Segmenting skills into smaller tasks reduces the demand on working memory and supports students with LD in processing new information to solve problems, applying strategies, and completing tasks (Vaughn et al., 2012). When teachers explicitly identify student misconceptions, provide models of how to correctly work through a skill or task, and allow students multiple practice opportunities, students build fluency and automaticity and encode new information into their long-term memory (Martin, 2016). "Danielson's Framework for Teaching: Convergence and Divergence with Conceptions of Effectiveness in Special Education" Morris-Mathews, Stark, Jones, Brownell, and Bell

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

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

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.

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

Person Responsible: Tara Ossler (osslert@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Data will be reviewed by the end of the first quarter.

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

Person Responsible: Tara Ossler (osslert@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Professional learning in explicit instruction will be provided by the end of the second quarter.

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

Person Responsible: Colleen Newman (newmanc@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and continuing until the end of the school year.

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

Person Responsible: Colleen Newman (newmanc@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and continuing until the end of the school year.

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

Person Responsible: Kathryn Hardesty (hardestyk@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and continuing until the end of the school year.

Monitor classroom small group instruction/schedules to ensure daily targeted intervention for all students.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Scaccia (scacciak@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and continuing until the end of the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 student resilience and engagement among our students with disabilities.

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

Reduce Student with Disabilities discipline referrals from 46% to 44%.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through quarterly review of EWS data. Secondly, a survey will be sent at the mid-year point to faculty and staff to monitor CKH effectiveness and areas of improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Critcher (critchern@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) wil be implemented to increase resiliency and engagement among our Students with Disabilities.

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

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:
1. Greeting students at the door with a handshake
2. Asking students to share good things in their lives
3. Having students create a social contract for expected classroom behavior
4. Posing four questions to redirect behavior
5. Using and encouraging students to use non-verbal hand signals to redirect behavior
6. Ending the class on a powerful note or launch

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 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).

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.

At the school level, school improvement allocations are determined through several processes such as comprehensive needs assessments, instructional resource review, review by the School Advisory Council.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes