

Okaloosa County School District

Annette P. Edwins Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Annette P. Edwins Elementary School

7 WRIGHT PKWY SW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okaloosa County School Board on 8/28/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We prepare all students to achieve excellence by providing the highest quality education while empowering each individual to positively impact their families, communities, and the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Edwins Mission Statement: At Edwins we strive to provide rigorous learning opportunities that result in significant academic gains within an environment of love and trust. Edwins is an amazing place to teach and learn.

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
Armstrong, K	Principal	Development and oversight of the overall school program.
Reeder, Illa	Assistant Principal	Supports principal in development and oversight of overall school program. Lead of the ELA department.
Rounsaville, Renee	Instructional Coach	Works in collaboration with admin team to support teachers and implement school program. Works with teachers individually and as teams to ensure compliance to School Performance Plan and achievement of school goals.

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.

All teacher teams reviewed data and goals from 22-23 school year. Teams determined initiatives to continue or discontinue based on success and alliance to current goals. Instructional coach supported teams through this process.

Principal met with SAC to review data at end of school year and receive feedback about previous initiatives and goals for the following school year.

SIP Monitoring

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

This SIP will be part of all faculty meetings, instructional department meetings, data chats and Literacy Leadership team meetings. Data will be reviewed at each progress monitoring administration and adjustments will be made to plans as needed. Students in ESSA groups will be monitored in separate data chats along with MTSS meetings with teachers to monitor individual student progress.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) 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: C 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	0	12	15	13	14	6	0	0	0	60	
One or more suspensions	0	7	4	5	5	6	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	18	2	10	10	3	0	0	0	43	
Course failure in Math	0	18	2	12	9	2	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	15	17	25	18	19	0	0	0	94	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	25	11	22	16	14	0	0	0	88	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	17	25	18	19	0	0	0	94	

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	28	22	37	25	22	0	0	0	134

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	1	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	1	21	14	21	10	12	0	0	0	79	
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	2	0	5	9	2	0	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	2	0	1	6	1	4	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	14	25	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	13	18	0	0	0	47	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	19	14	25	0	0	0	64	

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	2	1	7	25	17	28	0	0	0	80

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	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	1	21	14	21	10	12	0	0	0	79	
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	2	0	5	9	2	0	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	2	0	1	6	1	4	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	14	25	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	13	18	0	0	0	47	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	19	14	25	0	0	0	64	

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	2	1	7	25	17	28	0	0	0	80

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	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*	38	59	53	36	61	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				44			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33					
Math Achievement*	47	65	59	48	47	50	45		
Math Learning Gains				62			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50					
Science Achievement*	33	57	54	21	63	59	28		
Social Studies Achievement*					61	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	74	60	59	68			26		

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	234
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
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	17	Yes	2	2
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	44			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	45			

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	25	Yes	1	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	47			

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%
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	45			

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	38			47			33					74
SWD	16			18			13				4	
ELL	23			47			20				5	74
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			27			36				3	
HSP	39			50			20				5	80
MUL	39			54			27				4	
PAC												
WHT	36			49			40				5	58
FRL	37			47			33				5	69

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	36	44	33	48	62	50	21					68
SWD	9	28	21	30	44	33	11					
ELL	28	53		41	47							68
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	32	32		42	50		9					
HSP	36	57		44	59		30					58
MUL	37	47		57	73		20					
PAC												
WHT	35	44	17	48	65	58	23					80
FRL	38	44	35	49	65	45	21					59

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	41	36		45	33		28					26
SWD	18	24		23	24		18					
ELL	33			47								26
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	10		27	20		8					
HSP	39			43								14
MUL	50			72								
PAC												
WHT	40	39		47	39		33					
FRL	41	21		40	25		22					

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	39%	61%	-22%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	67%	-28%	58%	-19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	65%	-14%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	72%	-17%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	63%	-16%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	57%	-28%	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.

In 22-23 Our ESE and Black students had the lowest performance overall. By breaking it down by grade level, our 5th grade had the lowest percent proficient ESE students and 4th had the lowest percent proficient of Black students although this only included 5 students. The students in our 3-5 grades often begin many years behind. Our gains data shows that interventions are working, but we are not filling the gap quickly enough.

Overall our data trended down from 2021 to 2022 but those trends went back upward from 22-23.

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

From 21-22 cohort groups dropped an average of 10 percentage points in 4th and 5th and 3-5 all saw drops in proficiency of about 6%. I think this data is indicative of students who missed the key elements of instruction during the pandemic combined with a year that included many teachers with little or no experience.

in 22-23 comparisons, each grade level showed growth from previous year data and cohorts also showed improved proficiency.

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.

Our ESE population had the greatest disparity in comparison with the district. Only 25% of those students were proficient in 21-22. In 22-23 that data did not improve. Specifically our 5th grade ESE students seem to be struggling the most. All of our 5th grade teachers and support staff have been trained in using ESE interventions and providing accommodations, but clearly we are not leveling the playing field properly for these students.

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

Over all our reading data improved 5% between 22 and 23. This is due to improvements in most areas.

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

Attendance is definitely an area of concern. We had nearly 80 students who had more than 10% absence rate.

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

Early intervention

Attendance

4th grade proficiency and gain (will need to include 5th grade as the cohort is moving up)

ESE proficiency in the gen ed setting. Are we providing all accommodations and supports?

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Attendance and discipline issues reduce the time spent in class learning. If we can create an environment that celebrates student achievement, promotes attendance, and uses intervention rather than punishment to address student behavior, we will increase learning time and reduce interruptions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 22-23 our average attendance rate was 92.06%. In 23-24 Edwins will attain 95% daily attendance rate at every grade level.

Additionally, in 2023 there were 108 students with attendance below 90% and 77 students with 1 or more suspensions. In 23-24 that our goal will be that no more than 50 students have attendance below 90% and we will have less than 35 students with 1 or more suspensions.

Monitoring:

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

Our Dean of Students will monitor attendance and discipline and report weekly during our leadership meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.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.)

Edwins implemented PBIS in the 21-22 school year with fidelity with instruction in the Zones of Regulation for students and staff. Positive behavior is rewarded in all areas of campus and a token economy allows students to "shop" for rewards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students are aware of their emotional states, they will be better able to self-regulate and reduce time lost due to discipline. Behavior expectations are taught explicitly and reviewed when intervention is required. Positive behavior is rewarded in all areas of campus.

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.

Monitor attendance, call EWS targets when absent. - Dean

On second referral students will meet with MTSS and develop behavior intervention. - Assistant Principal

Viking store will be maintained and run monthly - Principal

Students will receive reward bucks for positive behavior. - teachers

Person Responsible: K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: The PBIS system will be in place before school starts. The other two components will occur as needed and be reported during Leadership Team meeting.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

Black students earned 33% proficiency and only 32% learning gains in 21-22 in 22-23 we raised that number to 44% proficient and 62% gains. This is progress but we would still like to see both rates rise.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of black students will make learning gains and 55% of students will be proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be measured 3 times a year at the subgroup level. In addition, all students will be monitored through the MTSS using iReady, common monthly assessments and teacher grades. The Literacy Leadership team will review this data at each meeting and discuss any changes that need to be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.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.)

All of Okaloosa County uses iReady to remediate students below grade level. Based on the research of Dr. Douglas Reeves who researches successful high-poverty schools, we will implement 3 identified characteristics of these successful schools.

- 1- data rich environment that shows students growth to students
- 2- teacher clarity will be improved with explicit expectation statements (I can) with success criteria
- 3-common assessment with non-fiction writing in all subjects

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies increase student success for all subgroups, but especially for students who are not experiencing success. These students will know what is expected to learn, what that looks like, where they are in reference to the target and then have an opportunity to assess their own learning. This is also supported in Visible Learning. Additionally, with a school-wide focus on growth, students will

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.

Assess all students in iReady.

Create intervention groups and place students in subgroup on their individual learning path.

Teachers will be trained in using expectation and success criteria.

Teachers will work with literacy coach to develop monthly non-fiction writing to determine understanding of

major area standards.

Teachers will use common scoring and review students work and provide opportunity for student to score and review/redo their work.

Data will be made transparent for students.

Person Responsible: K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: All training and materials will be ready by August 10. Common assessment with scoring will begin in September.

#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.

ESE students make up about 25% of Edwins population. We serve 4 self-contained units of students with autism and the remaining students are served in our gen-ed classrooms. In 21-22 only 25% of our students with disabilities were proficient. In 22-23 this dropped to 23%. This is a major concern even though 62% of ESE students made learning gains. They are moving, but not enough to become proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

50% of ESE students will be proficient and 75% will make learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be measured 3 times a year at the subgroup level. In addition, all students will be monitored through the MTSS and IEP process using iReady, common monthly assessments and teacher grades. The Literacy Leadership team will review this data at each meeting and discuss any changes that need to be made. ESE team will also address this data during monthly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Illa Reeder (reederi@okaloosaschools.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.)

Ortan-Gillingham strategies will be used in all self-contained classrooms and by the ESE resource teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ortan-Gillingham has been recognized for its methods in the Science of Reading.

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.

ESE Teachers will be trained in Ortan-Gillingham program.

Teachers will implement the program during small group instruction or resource pull out.

Person Responsible: K Armstrong (armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: Training will occur before school starts and implementation will begin before the end of August.

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)).

General funds and principals discretionary will be used as follows.

- General school funds will be used to purchase materials for Expectations posters.
- The district funds a full time instructional coach who will support teachers in the implementation of expectations & success criteria as part of instruction. The coach will also support teachers as they roll out common assessments with scoring.
- The district paid for training of ESE teachers.
- Principal's Discretionary funds will be used to train additional teachers in the Orton-Gillingham intervention.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

K students were 53% proficient in the spring of 23. 1st grade was 46% & 2nd grade was 49%. With that information Edwins is implementing a daytime tutoring program to serve our students in K-3. We will have 4 full time tutors working in groups of 3-5 using Benchmark Interventions. Students will be grouped by their level and provided intense remediation with trained tutors using research-based materials.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

FAST data at the end of 2023 showed:

3rd grade was 38% proficient
4th grade was 39% proficient
5th grade was 39% proficient

In addition to our Title pull out/push in intervention, we also have 2 para pros that push into grades 3-5 to offer additional support in planned small groups. We have also brought our ELL interpreters into the planning process and will use them to preview and scaffold upcoming instruction to support emergent

learners.

3-5 students will also benefit from the daytime tutoring offered by the 4 dedicated tutors with research based materials.

School-wide we have implemented objective statements as well as success criteria to help students have a better understanding of what they are learning and where they are related to the target. This is referenced repeatedly in the Visible Learning research as well as the Schools of Equity and Excellence research.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Based on FAST for the spring of 22-23 and then Fall of 23-24

K students were 53% proficient

1st grade was 46%

2nd grade was 49%

Our goals is that 70% of Kindergarten students will be proficient by the end of the year

Our 1st graders started out this year with 34% proficiency and we want them to grow to 60% proficient.

Our 2nd graders started out this year with 30% proficiency and we want them to grow to 60% proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

FAST data at the end of 2023 showed:

3rd grade was 38% proficient

4th grade was 39% proficient

5th grade was 39% proficient

Our first diagnostic for the 23 24 school year shows

3rd grade starting at 17% proficient

4th grade starting at 24% proficient

5th grade starting at 18% proficient

Our goals is that all of these grade levels will be 55% proficient by the spring of 23 24.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Our area of focus of early literacy will be monitored in two ways. We will assess progress three times a year with FAST and iReady. We will also assess at designated increments in our tutoring program using

the Benchmark interventions. Student groupings and materials will be adjusted based on evolving student needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Armstrong, K, armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Benchmark interventions used in tutoring: This text has been adopted by the district and approved by the state. Its content aligns with our K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and the BEST ELA Standards.

Explicit use of objectives with success criteria as part of daily instruction has a .84 effect size (.4 is average). It is also evidence-based, aligned to our K-12 plan and the BEST ELA standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Benchmark Interventions program was selected in collaboration with the Okaloosa County Schools. We trained on it last year and the tutoring had promising results last year. This year we will be even more intentional with dedicated tutoring pool and interventions scheduled during the school day.

The Equity in Education research targeted schools with high rates of poverty and high rates of reading proficiency. Edwins has 80% of our students receiving free and reduced meals. The research is relevant to us.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Meet with Literacy Leadership Team and develop the scaffold for both the tutoring and the explicit objectives initiatives. Develop a plan for how to roll out both and provide training as needed to teachers.	Armstrong, K, armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com
Identify a tutoring lead and work with them to choose other tutors, develop a schedule, and arrange for training using the Benchmark Intervention kits. Lead will also look at spring data to determine students to receive intervention. Literacy Coach will begin whole group and small group mentoring and modeling of "objectives" initiative. Coach plans weekly with each grade level and will teach teachers how to find or develop measurable and specific objectives for each lesson. Admin will walk through classes and provide feedback on objectives and their use.	Armstrong, K, armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com
Tutoring will begin and be monitored by tutoring lead as well as admin. Student will participate in small progress monitoring assessments as designated in Benchmark Intervention. Students will also be assessed using iReady and STAR at the mid-year. We will evaluate data at that time to determine next steps or course corrections.	Armstrong, K, armstrongk@okaloosaschools.com
By mid-year teachers should be using both objectives (i can) statements as well as success criteria. Students should be aware of success criteria and be able to measure their ability to meet that criteria at the end of each lesson. Admin will ask students about the success criteria during weekly classroom visits.	

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SIP and progress monitoring will be shared with faculty and staff during monthly meetings and at data chats. Families provided feedback in the SAC meeting at the end of the school year and will continue to be informed throughout the year (at each progress monitoring) as to the progress. Additionally data is shared with families in a digital newsletter that is pushed out to all families.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Edwins strives to involve more community members in the school mission. Last year we started a parent group that supported our PBIS initiatives. Multiple events are hosted throughout the year to engage parents in the academic and social program at Edwins. Attendance is high. Business and community partners provide financial support as well as volunteer hours within the school working with students. webpage: <https://www.okaloosaschools.com/o/edwins>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

ESE, Black subgroup Area of Focus

Our academic program will be strengthened by increasing student awareness of what they are learning and how they are doing in relation to the goals. Data will become ever present and discussed. Students and teachers will create goals and progress monitor. This data will be shared with parents during open house events.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Title I programs and funding support the missions described above via personnel and money to provide materials and supplies.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Edwins has both a school counselor and mental health counselor on campus five days a week. These professionals work with individuals, therapeutic small groups and intervention groups. Our MTSS team coordinates services with these roles to ensure students are receiving any support they may need.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Edwins partners with a local manufacturing company. The company brings technology experiences into the school as well as holding field trips to their facilities. We also have a partnership with the local technical college and have plans to visit there. Our Minority Council visits local colleges to introduce students to higher education.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Edwins has a robust MTSS program. All students participate in a Tier 1 positive intervention program. When students have multiple office referrals we work with the teacher and parents to develop a PMP for behavior and begin implementing Tier 2 strategies and tracking success of those strategies. We also make referrals to our mental health supports if needed. If students are still not finding success we move to more intensive strategies usually with the help of our behavior interventionist.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

All OCSD employees participate in professional development. Our faculty received de-escalation training as well as training in ELA and Math best practices. We hold monthly PL meetings as well as engage in professional learning with our instructional coaches weekly. We partner with iReady to provided training on understanding and using data provided by that program.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We added an additional VPK class to our school this year. We also held a Kindergarten Kickstart to give 75% of our incoming kindergarteners an opportunity to learn the first year basics a few weeks in advance. We also provided home materials for families to use with their children in preparation of their first days of school.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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.

No