

Flagler Schools

Iflagler Virtual Franchise School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Iflagler Virtual Franchise

1769 E MOODY BLVD, Bunnell, FL 32110

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 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 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
Quinn, Erin	Principal	The Principal's role is to provide strategic targeted direction for iFlagler Virtual Programs. It is her responsibility to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Evaluate the effectiveness of the iFlagler team as a whole -Oversee the day-to-day operations of the school -Create, review, and revise all school policies and procedures to ensure we are providing an environment of structure and support within the organization -Hire and evaluate staff -Assess teaching methodology and ensure that all academic policies and curriculum are followed -Encourage and support the development of innovative instructional programs -Find and develop talent within the organization to grow instructional leaders -Develop and track benchmarks for student success and monitor student progress and achievement -Develop safety protocols and emergency response procedures -Manage the school budget -Provide an atmosphere free of bias and judgment where students and staff can reach their maximum potential

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.

iFlagler involves all stakeholders through monthly Newsletters, surveys, and School Advisory Council meetings. Survey data is collect from students, parents/guardians, and staff to access areas of strengths and areas of improvement school wide. During SAC meetings stakeholders discuss results and collaborate on strategies for school improvement. The annual SIP plan is shared at SAC meetings for feedback and approval.

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 monitored quarterly by all stakeholders. School administration will facilitate monthly PLC meetings with teachers and paraprofessionals. Data from state F.A.S.T. testing will be reviewed after each progress monitoring session. PLCs will review mastery of standards and shift explicit instruction to meet those needs.

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)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
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)* 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: I

	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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

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	2	0	7	9

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	0	0	0	
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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	4	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	2	6	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	6

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	7	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	4	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	2	6	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3

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	7	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	49	51	50	62	51	51	68		
ELA Learning Gains				67			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			33		
Math Achievement*	31	42	38	43	35	38	49		
Math Learning Gains				64			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			34		
Science Achievement*	59	72	64	52	39	40	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	61	65	66	53	38	48	72		
Middle School Acceleration				11	34	44	38		
Graduation Rate		91	89		67	61			
College and Career Acceleration		50	65		61	67			
ELP Progress		55	45						

* 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	77
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	78
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			

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				

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	77			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	55			

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	49			31			59	61				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												

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	71			53			71	58			4	
FRL												

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	62	67	53	43	64	53	52	53	11			
SWD	36			22								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	42		32	38							
HSP	82	80		63	72		90					
MUL	73			33								
PAC												
WHT	78	63	40	57	70		79	85	8			
FRL	63	53		44	61							

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	68	52	33	49	35	34	56	72	38			
SWD	26	25	20	18	29							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	48	27	32	27		46	55				
HSP	78	56		51	39		54					
MUL	63	47		45	32	27	44					
PAC												
WHT	72	54	30	51	35	33	62	74	36			
FRL	62	44	32	39	26	29	41	70	27			

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
10	2023 - Spring	46%	51%	-5%	50%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	47%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	47%	6%
09	2023 - Spring	74%	51%	23%	48%	26%
06	2023 - Spring	69%	52%	17%	47%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	45%	-7%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	65%	-15%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	55%	-2%	44%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	56%	-4%	50%	2%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	51%	-9%	48%	-6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	71%	-6%	63%	2%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	71%	-10%	66%	-5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	65%	-9%	63%	-7%

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.

Reading across all grade levels showed the lowest performance. Specifically, the subgroup populations have the greatest need for improvement. Some of the contributing factors to the need for improvement involve student and family participation. Many of our students did not participate in state testing. Additionally, teacher live lessons, tutoring sessions, and ESE support groups have low attendance.

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

Our overall Reading scores showed the greatest decline. Especially in the ESSA subgroups. Some factors that contributed to this decline was poor attendance and minimal remediation. The majority of students did not participate in PM1 or PM2 testing . Student attendance for live lessons and face-to-face tutoring is also extremely low. Students and teachers aren't reviewing data or content often enough.

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 with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the high school reading scores.

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

Overall math scores showed the most improvement. We implemented targeted professional learning and PLCs where teachers learned effective strategies for working with students in the virtual setting.

Professional learning

and PLCs focused on feedback and student data. The math teachers provided test prep and EOC spiral review practice with answer keys. In addition to live and recorded virtual lessons, teachers provided more direct practice opportunities with face-to-face instruction every Friday. Additionally, 100% of third graders passed the end of year reading test for promotion.

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

Our largest area of concern is attendance. Due to the nature of virtual education, students complete work at a flexible pace. Attendance to live lessons, face-to-face tutoring, ESE support groups, help sessions, and school events is low. Students also fall behind in coursework which means they aren't actively participating in their learning.

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

Our highest priority is raising student achievement for our SWDs population in reading and math. Our second priority is raising student achievement in reading across all grade levels. Our third priority is increasing the number of students tested in all grade levels.

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 Professional Learning Communities**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.

In a review of last year's data and professional practices, we identified Instructional Practices related to PLCs and reviewing student data to drive instruction as a critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to achieve an increase in overall reading scores in grades K-10 by 3 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

PLCs will be held twice a month every other week with all teachers and school counselor. Administration will provide the data to be used in the meeting. Teachers will drill down the standards to identify which students are struggling with which standards. Face-to-face instruction, live lessons, and remediation lessons will target these identified students and standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Quinn (quinne@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 interventions will be our working PLCs, student data retrieved from progress monitoring, and student content unit test scores.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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
- collaborative teams
- Collective inquiry
- A commitment to continuous improvement
- An action and results-oriented mindset.

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.

Sources:

<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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

In a review of last year's data and professional practices, we identified the EWS of attendance as an area of critical need. Only 78% of students participated in state testing in the 22-23 school year. We need to increase testing participation by 17%. Additionally, attendance to live lessons, face-to-face instruction opportunities, and ESE and MTSS support sessions are very low.

Measurable Outcome:

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

iFlagler Virtual School plans to achieve 95% of students to participate in state testing. Additionally we plan to increase attendance to ESE and MTSS support session to 90%.

Monitoring:

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

iFlagler Virtual School will provide numerous ways of communication in an effort to ensure all families are receiving notification in advance of testing dates and schedules. We will monitor who receives the notifications and reach back out to families who haven't. Through the implementation of CKH building strong relationships with all stakeholders will increase rapport and the opportunities to discuss the importance of student and parent participation in testing and support sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Quinn (quinne@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 the evidence-based intervention being implemented to help increase attendance, and student and parent involvement.

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:

- 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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.

After reviewing our previous year's data, we see a critical need to actively engage our SWD with their related services to increase their achievement rates.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2023, our SWD population will attend their related services 80% of the time as documented in group attendance logs.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom teachers and ESE support facilitators will keep attendance logs related to support services. The attendance logs will be monitored by school administrators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Quinn (quinne@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 strategy that will be implemented for this area of focus is to increase communication and awareness to our students and families regarding the importance of attendance to support service groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The list of students who should be engaged with ESE services will be pulled, the schedules created for delivery of services will be reviewed, and the current practice for communicating the schedule of services to parents will be reviewed and evaluated for effectiveness.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus