

Okaloosa County School District

Baker 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 | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 19 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 25 |

Baker School

1369 14TH ST, Baker, FL 32531

[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.

We inspire a lifelong passion for learning.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Martello, Mike | Principal | |
| Hurley, Victoria | Assistant Principal | |
| Richards, Elizabeth | Assistant Principal | |
| | | |
| Card, Amy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Meeks, Amber | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Crenshaw, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Capps, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Nixon, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Cosson, Jonna | Teacher, K-12 | |

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.

School administrators will present the data findings to the SAC as well as the school leadership team. All team members including students have an opportunity for input. Throughout the year parent surveys are conducted asking for feedback about the programs we are offering and what they would like to be available for their students.

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))

School administrators lead the leadership team in student identification and data review. The leadership team reviews and tracks students by their grade/subject. We met monthly to monitor attendance, classroom grades and testing data of identified students. For students not making progress additional supports will be encouraged/implemented. Referrals to the MTSS committee will be generated for students not responding to strategies implemented by the leadership team.

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) | Combination School PK-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 10% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 54% |
| 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) 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: B 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 | 1 | 28 | 20 | 28 | 18 | 14 | 23 | 30 | 19 | 181 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 19 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 18 | 8 | 22 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 83 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 53 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 23 | 12 | 19 | 29 | 30 | 157 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 1 | 25 | 8 | 13 | 23 | 13 | 21 | 9 | 7 | 120 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 23 | 12 | 19 | 29 | 30 | 157 |

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 | 1 | 29 | 19 | 23 | 27 | 16 | 26 | 30 | 33 | 204 |

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 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 21 | 270 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 40 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 5 | 11 | 19 | 3 | 5 | 74 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 89 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 31 | 17 | 26 | 20 | 196 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 23 | 26 | 23 | 17 | 186 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 31 | 17 | 26 | 20 | 196 |

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 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 32 | 30 | 31 | 28 | 268 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 |

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 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 21 | 157 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 24 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 5 | 11 | 19 | 3 | 5 | 64 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 34 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 31 | 17 | 26 | 20 | 115 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 23 | 26 | 23 | 17 | 106 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 31 | 17 | 26 | 20 | 115 | |

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 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 32 | 30 | 31 | 28 | 151 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 |

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* | 54 | 58 | 53 | 54 | 60 | 55 | 54 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52 | | | 49 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41 | | | 30 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 62 | 67 | 55 | 56 | 42 | 42 | 47 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 59 | | | 37 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54 | | | 33 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 60 | 63 | 52 | 56 | 65 | 54 | 52 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 56 | 67 | 68 | 70 | 64 | 59 | 63 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 57 | 61 | 70 | 52 | 53 | 51 | 60 | | |
| Graduation Rate | 91 | 64 | 74 | 98 | 58 | 50 | 92 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 51 | 42 | 53 | 53 | 76 | 70 | 58 | | |
| ELP Progress | | 53 | 55 | | 59 | 70 | | | |

* 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 | 60 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 477 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | 91 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 645 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | 98 |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 43 | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| HSP | 66 | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | |
| FRL | 53 | | | |

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 | 41 | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 43 | | | |

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 | 68 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

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 | 54 | | | 62 | | | 60 | 56 | 57 | 91 | 51 | |
| SWD | 33 | | | 43 | | | 29 | 40 | | 30 | 7 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | | | 21 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 56 | | | 76 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| MUL | 52 | | | 63 | | | 77 | | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | | | 62 | | | 60 | 57 | 57 | 52 | 8 | |
| FRL | 47 | | | 55 | | | 48 | 57 | 46 | 41 | 8 | |

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 | 54 | 52 | 41 | 56 | 59 | 54 | 56 | 70 | 52 | 98 | 53 | |
| SWD | 27 | 40 | 33 | 32 | 44 | 39 | 36 | 47 | | 95 | 21 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 36 | 42 | | 30 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 59 | 52 | | 74 | 70 | | 83 | 70 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 53 | 41 | 55 | 59 | 55 | 56 | 69 | 48 | 98 | 53 | |
| FRL | 47 | 50 | 39 | 49 | 53 | 53 | 47 | 61 | 38 | 97 | 41 | |

| 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 | 54 | 49 | 30 | 47 | 37 | 33 | 52 | 63 | 60 | 92 | 58 | |
| SWD | 28 | 29 | 18 | 30 | 34 | 26 | 32 | 34 | | 93 | 23 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 50 | | 31 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | 68 | | 55 | 35 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 49 | 30 | 47 | 37 | 31 | 53 | 63 | 60 | 91 | 59 | |
| FRL | 45 | 42 | 27 | 38 | 35 | 28 | 45 | 52 | 63 | 86 | 55 | |

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 | 52% | 59% | -7% | 50% | 2% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 61% | -17% | 54% | -10% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 54% | -10% | 47% | -3% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 57% | -1% | 47% | 9% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 54% | 5% | 48% | 11% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 67% | 1% | 58% | 10% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 57% | 3% | 47% | 13% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 55% | -11% | 50% | -6% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 65% | 7% | 54% | 18% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 76% | 75% | 1% | 48% | 28% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 65% | -13% | 59% | -7% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 72% | -5% | 61% | 6% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 69% | -18% | 55% | -4% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 63% | -3% | 55% | 5% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 61% | 4% | 44% | 21% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 57% | -10% | 51% | -4% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 59% | -18% | 50% | -9% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 73% | 61% | 12% | 48% | 25% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 66% | -2% | 63% | 1% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 63% | 70% | -7% | 66% | -3% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 69% | -24% | 63% | -18% |

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.

ELA 55% proficiency was maintained from previous year. ELA made a 3% increase in learning gains with a 11% increase amongst the 25th percentile. Math proficiency increased 9% with a 22% increase in learning gains. Science proficiency increased 4% and social studies increased 7%.

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

School wide the greatest need for improvement is with our ELA content. ELA as a whole maintained the same level of proficiency as the previous year. We did show a small increase in learning gains with the greatest gains coming from the lowest 25th percentile. We did not show an increase in learning gains amongst our proficient students. Our Black/African American subgroup performed the lowest among our ELA subgroups.

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 overall achievement of all students was above the state average in all subject areas. However, our lowest performing area was ELA. We believe that students missed many foundational skills during COVID and it has been more difficult to remediate. We have also noticed a decline in students reading for pleasure or engaging with text outside of classroom instruction.

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

We saw an 11% increase in ELA learning gains with SWD with an increase of 15% among the lowest 25 percentile. There was a 13% increase in Math learning gains with SWD and in the lowest 25% of SWD. Overall, students made a slight increase in ELA in proficiency as well as learning gains. The lowest 25% of White students made the greatest increase at 11%. FRL students showed an overall 2% increase in achievement in ELA. The FRL ELA learning gains increased by 8% with a 12% increase among the lowest 25%. The multiracial subgroup increased 19% on Math Achievement with a 35% increase in Learning Gains.

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

ELA achievement within our Black/African American subgroup showed significant learning loss of 11%. The ELA Black/African American subgroup gains was also down by 8%. Math achievement is down 1%.

The multiracial subgroup is the highest performing of our subgroups but they are down in ELA by 8% from previous year. The ELA learning gains is down 16%.

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

Building relationships with at risk students to improve attendance, increase layers of support, individualize academic paths and improve overall feelings of self-efficacy.

Increase the proficiency of our Black/African American population through academic support, increased parent involvement, positive behavior plan and positive attendance goals.

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.

22% of students in the 2022-23 school year had attendance under 90%. Of these identified students many of them are below proficiency and in need of additional support. When students have improved attendance, their academic performance improves. We will motivate the students to come to school by tracking their attendance data by grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see a decrease in student absences, decreasing the percentage of students earning above 90% attendance to 20% by mid-year and 18% by the end of the year.

Monitoring:

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

We will motivate the students to come to school by tracking their attendance data by grade level. Each week the chart will be updated for each grade level. The grade level with the highest number of perfect attendance days will receive a pizza party. This award will be given each quarter at the honors assembly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Richards (richardse@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.)

Students who are frequently absent as defined by missing 5 or more days in a nine weeks, will receive support from the school counselor to determine causes. We will address the issues that may be hindering them from attending school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Goal setting and tracking data with feedback is one of John's Hattie's high effect size strategies. Research also shows that students who have low attendance are often living in poverty, struggle with self esteem, and social skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

Our Black/African American subgroup is our lowest performing at a 36% on the Federal Point Index. Anything below a 41% is an indication of a critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Of the identified students 62% will score a level 3 or higher on the end of year FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom teachers and administration will monitor students' progress quarterly through data chats. The data used to track students will include Benchmark Assessment, iReady Diagnostic, FAST assessment, and teacher observation. Administration will monitor best practices through walk-throughs and formal/informal observations. The Literacy Leadership Team will also review progress and make school wide suggestions for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Richards (richardse@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.)

Deliver instruction that fosters student engagement via meaningful interactions with texts utilizing approved resources to include Benchmark Advance and iReady to develop lessons and tasks that promote comprehension and analysis of complex texts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Benchmark curriculum features culturally responsive instruction and equitable resources, engendering a sense of community through reflective dialogue as they expand knowledge. Diverse authors and illustrators share authentic stories that reflect students' own experiences and broaden their perspectives, accessibility tools, multimodal learning opportunities, embedded differentiation, and targeted intervention to scaffold instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Schools are provided a training and timeline from the Curriculum and Instruction Department to complete the School Improvement Plan (SIP). District offers collaborative opportunities for schools to meet:

- Facilitate sharing and presentation of district-level data.
- Support the inclusion of a variety of data sources; assist data collection efforts with district resources and connections.
- Bring schools together to focus on related priorities in order to pool expertise and resources.

Schools then conduct a needs assessment to stakeholders and prioritize needs to be included in SIP. District reviews school SIP and during review process ensures school identifies allowable funding sources that are not currently being utilized to implement the strategy(s) intended to improve learner outcomes; instructional coaches, tutoring, ESE resources, and professional learning. If funding does not match school's identified focus areas, the District will engage school in further conversation with inquiries such as;

- Connect schools with available statewide systems of support, including external facilitators and high quality professional development (FDLRS and FIN).
- Identify the necessary resources that are not currently available to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
- Determine what training is necessary for teachers to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.

After District provides feedback to schools, the SIP will be refined and submitted. School district leadership will meet quarterly with schools for collaborative discussion, feedback, and progress monitoring updates on status of SIP focus areas.

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

Implement a strong focus on multi-sensory foundational learning to support comprehension and analysis of grade-level appropriate texts found in Benchmark Advance and iReady; oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, and fluency.

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

Purposefully integrate the six B.E.S.T. ELA expectations into standards-based lessons and tasks. Cite evidence to explain and justify reasoning. Read and comprehend grade-level complex texts proficiently. Make inferences to support comprehension. Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussion in a variety of situations. Use the accepted rules governing a specific format to create quality work. Use appropriate voice and tone when speaking, or writing.

Deliver instruction that fosters student engagement via meaningful interactions with text(s) utilizing approved resources including Benchmark Advance and iReady to develop lessons and tasks that promote comprehension and analysis of complex text(s).

Implement the gradual release framework within whole group and small group instruction. I do (teacher modeling), we do (teacher/student collaboration). You do it together (student collaboration with teacher assistance, as needed), You do it along (student demonstrates skill/concept independently)

Strategically integrate the components of close reading that lead to a culminating task using grade-level complex text(s) to include purposeful text-dependent questions, text-marking, annotations, writing through reading, and student talk.

Implementation of tier one small group instruction during the reading block along with tier two and tier three during the Gator Block time.

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

At the end of the 2023 school year, our STAR data indicated that our kindergarten students scored 75% proficient which was over the district percent proficient of 68%. Our goal for this year is to maintain 75% proficiency or greater.

1st-grade end of 2023 STAR data indicated that our first-grade students scored 67% proficient which was over the district percent proficient of 60%. Our goal for this year is to maintain the 67% proficient or greater.

2nd-grade end of the 2023 STAR data indicated that our second-grade students scored 60% proficient which was over the district percent proficient of 57%. Our goal for this year is to maintain the 60% or greater.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In the spring of 2023, our FAST data indicated that our third-grade students scored 44% proficient which was below the district percent proficiency of 55%. Our goal for this year is to see our third-grade students increase their proficiency to that of the district at 55%.

Fourth-grade end-of-2023 data put our percent proficient at 68% while the district was at 67% proficient. Our goal for this year is to maintain the 67% proficient or greater.

Fifth grade end of 2023 data showed our percent proficient at 44% which was below the district proficiency level of 61%. Our goal for this year is to increase our fifth-grade proficiency to 61% or greater.

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.

Classroom teachers and administration will monitor student's progress quarterly through data charts. the data used to track students will include Benchmark Assessments, iReady Diagnostic, F.A.S.T assessments, and teacher observation. Administrators will monitor best practices through walk-throughs and formal-informal observations. The Literacy team will also review progress and make school-wide suggestions for improvement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Martello, Mike, martellom@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?

Data-driven instructional plans and practice reflect the use of district-approved resources including Benchmark Advance, pacing guides, and B.E.S.T. Benchmark Booklet.

Utilize instructional engagement strategies for effective, engaging reading instruction, Pre-reading strategies to include journaling, activating prior knowledge, essential questions, previewing a text, identifying labeling text features, and making predictions.

Foundation skills such as oral language, phonemic awareness, phonics, high-frequency words, and fluency using multi-sensory instructional strategies.

Pre-teach vocabulary

Whole and small group interactive student talk (eg. Go-Go-Mo, Turn and Talk/Think-Pair-Share, Slides, Socratic Seminar)

Text-Dependent Questions at the appropriate DOK level with intentional focus and purpose

Utilize close reading strategies to include making connections, questioning, visualizing, text marking, annotating, citing text evidence, and graphic organizers.

Utilize close reading strategies to include making connections, questioning, visualizing, text-marking, annotating, citing text evidence, and graphic organizers.

Small group and cooperative group learning utilizing Benchmark Advance resources.

Gradual Release Framework (I do, we do, you do it together, and you do it alone)

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?

Florida Benchmark Advances program is aligned to the science of reading research. It is designed to reflect current and confirmed research on learning to read and teaching reading. It maximizes the potential of every student by building knowledge across grade levels, as well as providing the resources to scaffold and teach students at their independent level.

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 |
|---|---|
| Our Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to team review student data and School Performance Plan goals. Action plans are developed for any areas of concern. | |
| The Literacy Coach is on campus four days a week providing training through coaching rounds with individual teachers. The Coach is also leading a book study. | |
| All students participate in formative and summative testing. Admin, teachers, and instruction coaches conduct data chats for the purpose of identifying services needed for students, and professional learning opportunities for teachers. | Richards, Elizabeth, richardse@okaloosaschools.com |
| Teachers will attend two iReady trainings during the year. The focus of the training is to understand and analyze the diagnostic data to plan for remediation or acceleration through iReady. Teachers will have three professional training days to focus on interactive whole-group instruction along with small-group instruction. | |
| Teachers will attend a Science of Reading Professional Learning day. | |

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.

Baker School looks for many ways to partner with our parents and community as well as inform them of the progress and concerns within our school. Our SAC committee is comprised of community members, faculty members and students. Those positions are nominated and elected by stakeholders. SAC meetings are held once a month and a report from Title 1 as well as progress on our SIP are shared at each meeting. Last year we reestablished our PTO which involves parents and teachers. Our school data, and areas of concerns are shared during meetings. This group is very responsive to our school/ students needs and provides feedback to the school leaders. We also disseminate information through our website (www.okaloosaschools.com/o/baker), Facebook, Instagram, Thrillshare, parent newsletters, Remind App and PikMyKid.

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))

Baker administration and Title 1 work to develop a climate with parent/families and community stakeholders. Parents are invited on campus for a variety of activities including: Open House, Grade

level family engagement activities, quarterly honors assemblies, extracurricular/fine arts events, Kindergarten and 5th grade transition nights, field trips, field days, etc. Communication with parents is ongoing throughout the year utilizing a variety of tools such as Remind, DOJO, newsletters, email, phone calls, conferences, social media, website, etc. Parents have real time access to their students' academic performance such as testing data, attendance, classroom grades, etc. through our FOCUS Parent Portal.

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))

The foundation of the academic program at Baker School is the interactive whole group instruction which is supported by Tier 2 small group remediation. Tier 3 small group remediation is implemented daily for students who show significant need. In addition, students are offered before, during and after school tutoring. Baker School serves our ESE students through a variety of push-in and pullout services.

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))

Baker Elementary School is a Title 1 school and participates in the Federal Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Title 1 resources are used to help meet the needs of our students and are evident in this plan through personnel, student materials, classroom instructional materials, parent involvement activities/resources, and technology support.

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))

School psychologists, mental health counselors, social workers and guidance counselors advocate for the mental health needs of all students. This is accomplished by offering instruction and/or support that emphasizes awareness of mental health, academic learning strategies, as well as career and social/emotional development; short-term counseling interventions; and referrals to community resources for long-term support when warranted.

Okaloosa County School District ensures that each campus within the district has no less than three mental health providers assigned to the schools. The team works closely together to determine that the child is receiving the services needed to help them be successful academically and social emotionally. The team will work with outside agencies such as, outside counselors, Department of Child and Family Services, Mobile Response Teams, etc. when needed.

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))

Students have an opportunity to learn about careers through social studies curriculum. Our school also partners with business leaders who are welcomed as guest speakers, i.e. credit union, dentist, etc. We have an elementary coding club that rotates three times a year to allow the greatest amount of

participation. As 5th graders prepare to transition to middle school they have the opportunity to learn out our CTE programs. All 6th graders will select one or more CTE tracks to follow in middle school.

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).

All students with behavior or academic concerns will receive an individual plan to improve and monitor their progress. Baker has a Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) which is Tier 1 for all students. Our focus is to reward the desired behaviors and reduce the unwanted behavior. The MTSS committee meets weekly to work with teachers and review students who are not responding to Tier 1. A Tier 2 intervention will include a PMP with behavior/academic strategies and weekly check ins. These students receive frequent small group support based on the team recommendation. Tier 3 includes daily check in with preferred adult. FBA or BIP implemented if needed. At this level knowledgeable others such as the Behavior Interventionist, Mental Health Counselor or Social Worker will assist with behavior plans and emotional regulation.

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))

The district provides professional learning opportunities for teachers based on their needs and level of experience. There is a new teacher program that includes a peer evaluator as well as peer mentor. All teachers attend training at the beginning of the year where they can select sessions that meet their individual needs. There are two additional training days that focus on the district central message and then two days of release time for teachers to collaborate and work on school based needs. All teachers have the opportunity to visit our model classroom as well as work with our reading or math Instructional Coaches that are based at our school four days a week.

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))

In the spring of each year our school host a parent night for incoming Kindergarteners. At this training we work with parents to understand the basic skills their student would benefit from. Parents are given a backpack full of resources to use with their child to help them prepare. During July we host a screening day where parents and students come to school and complete a series of task with a teacher in a kindergarten classroom. This time allows students to become familiar with our school and to review again with parents the skills that will help their child be kindergarten ready. We also host an Open House once students have been assigned to a teacher where they can come for a meet and greet in the classroom.

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 |

| | |
|--------|--------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|

Budget Approval

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

Yes