Wildlight Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wildlight Elementary

550 CURIOSITY AVE, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

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.

The mission of Wildlight Elementary School is to embrace diversity and create a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners who will reach their maximum potential academically, socially and developmentally in a safe and nurturing learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Wildlight Elementary is to allow all students to reach their maximum potential in all aspects of life by providing a safe learning environment, embracing diversity and creating a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners.

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
Nicholas-Bovinette, Amber	Principal	Coordinates administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services.
Ray, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Assists with coordination of administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services.
Chambers, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Assists with coordination of administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services.
McBee, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Representative
Hart, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Representative
Suhr, Madison	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Representative
Druelle, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Representative
Fancher, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Representative
Faucher, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	Reading Coach - ELA instructional leader and data analysis
Marks, Erin	Teacher, ESE	ESE Representative

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.

Teachers disaggregated data at the beginning of the school year based on PM3 data. They drilled down to specific standards that needed additional work within specific grade bands. This data is represented in this SIP, along with attendance and behavior data. Teachers were also surveyed about needs and input was gathered through the end of year School Improvement Plan goal ratings. Parent input and Business partner input is sought during SAC Committee meetings and annual/mid-year/end of year reviews of data and goals. The process is cyclical in nature, with student needs driving instruction and assessment, and funding for continued needs throughout the process.

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 school improvement plan is monitored at each data collection cycle and at mid-year and end of year time frames.

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	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	34%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) 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: 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	25	23	36	27	24	24	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	0	2	3	0	0	0	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	20	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	16	25	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	14	33	15	6	6	0	0	0	94
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	8	6	9	7	5	9	0	0	0	44

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	5	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	21	18	25	16	16	21	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	3	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	22	15	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	15	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	18	0	1	17	8	0	0	0	44
	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	6	4	2	13	6	5	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	1	2	2	7	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	21	18	25	16	16	21	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	3	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	22	15	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	15	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	18	0	1	17	8	0	0	0	44
	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	6	4	2	13	6	5	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	1	2	2	7	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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*	68	69	53	74	69	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				66			75		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			68		
Math Achievement*	73	77	59	79	53	50	91		
Math Learning Gains				60			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			74		
Science Achievement*	60	69	54	65	81	59	79		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					65	52			
Graduation Rate					70	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		50	59						

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	278
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	61			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	57			

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	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	71			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	58			

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	68			73			60					
SWD	46			39			29				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			58			67				4	
HSP	56			64			70				4	
MUL	76			72							3	
PAC												
WHT	72			76			58				4	
FRL	57			58			42				4	

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	74	66	55	79	60	55	65					
SWD	53	58	54	60	40	48	57					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63	67		58	55		56					
HSP	73	65		79	65		73					
MUL	76	69		77	71		38					
PAC												
WHT	76	66	56	82	59	57	70					
FRL	66	63	55	70	54	48	48					

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	81	75	68	91	84	74	79					
SWD	68	57		76	71	77	57					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	75			86			73					
HSP	91			100								
MUL	72			71								
PAC												
WHT	81	79	71	92	82	71	81					
FRL	73	55	50	83	76	56	65					

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	66%	73%	-7%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	71%	-5%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	69%	6%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	83%	76%	7%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	78%	-6%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	81%	-10%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	69%	-9%	51%	9%

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.

Science Achievement was the lowest performing area for 5th grade students in the 22-23 school year. Achievement level was 60%, 9% below the District average.

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

Historical data reflects that SWD students showed the greatest decline. Math learning gains of the lowest quartile declined from 71% to 40% (20-21 to 21-22 school years).

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.

Wildlight was above the state average in every tested subject area.

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

Third grade data showed that Wildlight was 6% above the District average in ELA at 75% proficiency and 7% above the District average in Math at 83% proficiency. These are 25% and 16% above the state average respectively. The third grade team fully implemented Benchmark curriculum with BEST standards.

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

In ELA K-5, there are 94 students identified with a substantial reading deficiency. 35 students in grades 3-5 made a level 1 in 22-23. 12 students currently identified as failing ELA. In Math, 45 students in grades 3-5 made a level 1 on state assessments for 22-23. 159 students were below the 90% attendance rate.

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

1. Increase ELA 3-5, overall proficiency rate and students with disabilities proficiency rate (subgroup)
2. Increase Math proficiency rate 3-5 and disabilities proficiency rate (subgroup)
3. Increase Science proficiency
4. Increase attendance rate and decrease suspension rate

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 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.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency was 71%. Although 8% above the state average, it is 5% below the District average. Fifth grade ELA proficiency was 66%, 7% below the District average. Historical data shows that SWD proficiency in 3-5 grades dropped from 68% to 53% (20-21 to 22-23 years).

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

The goal is to increase the 71% ELA proficiency rate to 76%. For SWDs, the goal is to increase ELA proficiency rate from 53% to 60%.

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

Students will be progress monitored three times a year using FAST and STAR. Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and/or the Literacy Coach will progress monitor using the following resources: Phonics screeners, Level Literacy Instruction LLI, and Benchmark Quick Checks. Data is reviewed by teachers weekly in their grade level PLCs. The Literacy coach and Administration provide teachers a data review and instructional planning session. Administration meets with the School Literacy Team, Leadership Team to discuss school wide data, and grade level data. Grade level teams meet weekly to discuss school wide data, grade level data, and individual teacher data. Grade levels review MTSS data weekly and update data and strategies as needed.
Students in identified subgroups-SWDs will be monitored with the assistance of the Reading Coach with our 4 day a week in-school intervention program and the use of after school tutoring with those that can attend.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

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.)

3rd through 5th grade students received daily small group differentiated phonics instruction and standards-based remedial core curriculum instruction as part of their 90-minute reading block. The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program, Freckle, and Sonday System are also used to provide Tier 3 interventions.

*Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)-(strong evidence-per Evidence for ESSA)
*Sonday System program aligns with the IES Practice Guided recommendations. (Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 5th grade.)
Other:
*After school tutoring is provided for students who demonstrate a reading deficiency.
*Preferential scheduling with our students with disabilities.
*Decreased the percentage of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

Provided professional development for teachers in the following area:
*Behavior Management, Specially Designed Instruction, Data-driven instruction
*Practice Profiles- Explicit and Scaffolded Instruction
*4 day a week in-school intervention program

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

The purpose of small group instruction is to address learning deficits. When students are placed in small groups of 2 to 6 and provided direct instructional support, student success increases.

The use of the Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention program provides educators effective intervention resources and strategies that allow students to apply each concept in increasingly challenging situations to build accuracy, automaticity, and fluency within the five reading components.

By using the Sonday System to target crucial foundational skills to students who are exhibiting extreme deficits in phonics and phonemic awareness.

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.

1. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction

2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS

3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need.

4. Intervention Time - utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards

5. Incorporating a more direct use Guided Model in small group instruction, explicit instruction and scaffolded instruction.

Person Responsible: Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Fourth grade Math proficiency shows 71%. While 11% above the state average, it is 6% below the District average. Fifth grade Math is 71%. While 16% above the state average, it is 10% below the district average. Historical data shows that Math achievement for students with disabilities declined from 76% to 60% and learning gains decreased from 71% to 40%.

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

Math proficiency in fourth and fifth grades will move from 71% to 75%. Math proficiency for SWDs will increase to 65% and learning gains will increase to 50%.

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

Students will be progress monitored three times a year using FAST and STAR. Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and/or the Literacy Coach will progress monitor using the following resources: District spiral math review, Benchmark and unit data. Data is reviewed by teachers weekly in their grade level PLCs. Administration to provide teachers a data review and instructional planning session. Administration meets with Leadership Team to discuss school wide data, and grade level data. Grade level teams meet weekly to discuss school wide data, grade level data, and individual teacher data. Grade levels review MTSS data weekly and update data and strategies as needed. Students in identified subgroups-SWDs will be monitored also during our after school tutoring with those that can attend.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Use of FLDOE's practice profiles - explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction, and use of corrective feedback.

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

These practice profiles are research-based, aligned to effective instruction, and related to Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards.

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.

3rd through 5th grade students received daily small group differentiated standards-based remedial core curriculum instruction as part of their 90-minute math block.

*Implement Daily Spiral review and monitor with fidelity.
*After school tutoring is provided for students who demonstrate a math deficiency.
*Preferential scheduling with our students with disabilities.
*Decreased the percentage of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

Provided professional development for teachers in the following area:
*Behavior Management, Specially Designed Instruction, Data-driven instruction
*Practice Profiles- Explicit and Scaffolded Instruction
*intervention program

Person Responsible: Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Science proficiency for the 22-23 school year was 60%, 9% below the District average.

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

Science proficiency will increase from 60% to 70%.

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

Students will be progress monitored two times a year using Science benchmark testing. Data is reviewed by teachers weekly in their grade level PLCs. Administration to provide teachers a data review and instructional planning session. Administration meets with Leadership Team to discuss school wide data, and grade level data. Grade level teams meet weekly to discuss school wide data, grade level data, and individual teacher data. Grade levels review MTSS data weekly and update data and strategies as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Use of FLDOE's practice profiles - explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction, and use of corrective feedback.

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

These practice profiles are research-based, aligned to effective instruction, and related to NGSS Standards.

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.

*Science bootcamp
*Integration of Science leveled readers into Reading instruction
*Use of collaborative District professional development with District-wide Science teachers.

Person Responsible: Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#4. 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.

The average daily attendance for 22-23 was 94%, with 149 students with attendance below 90%.
There were 116 discipline referrals for 22-23, with 59 for fighting/aggressive acts, and 31 students with one or more suspensions.

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

The average daily attendance will increase by 2% to 96% for the 23-24 school year, and we will decrease the number of students with attendance below 90% to 140.
The number of discipline referrals will decrease by 5% to 110, and the number of referrals for fighting/aggressive acts will decrease by 5% to 56. We will also decrease the number of students with one or more suspensions by 5% to 29 students. In addition, 75% of students receiving Tier 2 behavior interventions will demonstrate success.

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

Attendance data will be monitored weekly through FOCUS data.
Discipline/referral data will be monitored monthly through FOCUS data.
Tier 2 behavior intervention data will be monitored monthly via teacher data collection and monthly fidelity meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@nassau.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Student chosen incentives will be provided for individual and grade level attendance success. Family conferences will be conducted to determine the barriers for attending school and assist with mitigating said barriers. Check In/Check Out with an attendance mentor will be used to increase attendance and attendance contracts with the school social worker will be implemented at Tier 3 as needed.
Check In/Check Out will be utilized for Tier 2 behavior interventions. Goals will be set on a weekly basis and increased as negative behavior decreases. Mentor will provide instruction on self-monitoring and self-regulating strategies. Individual token boards utilized as a Tier 3 intervention as needed.

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

Determining the barriers for good attendance and assisting with mitigating those barriers ensures that all students have equal opportunity to attend school on a regular basis. A check in/check out mentor provides a point of contact at the school to assist with motivation to attend school regularly.
Check In/Check Out provides a way to assist the student with self-monitoring of behavior on a daily and weekly basis. The mentor will provide instruction on self-monitoring and self-regulating strategies, and role model as needed. Rewards on a frequent basis provide motivation and increase positive behavior.

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.

Student chosen attendance incentive program, family conferences to determine barriers for consistent attendance, and implementation of Check In/Check Out with an attendance mentor.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May, 2024

Implementation of Check In/Check Out as a Tier 2 behavior intervention, implementation of individual token boards as a Tier 3 behavior intervention.

Person Responsible: Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May, 2024