

Okaloosa County School District

Shoal River Middle 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Shoal River Middle School

3200 E REDSTONE AVE, Crestview, FL 32539

[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.

Placing students on a pathway to success by providing high quality instruction, a wide array of marketable experiences, and unparalleled extracurricular opportunities while developing relationships that meet both their academic and emotional needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Shoal River has a vision to provide a rigorous, safe, and positive learning environment for every student through the cooperative efforts of the school, home, and community. Shoal River has a mission to empower students to excel as contributing members of society by guaranteeing a quality educational foundation.

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
Driver, Jason	Principal	
Nutt, Kayla	Assistant Principal	
Kimbrough, Ben	Assistant Principal	

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.

We involve all stakeholders in the development of the SIP by communicating and sharing information in a purposeful and consistent way. Every stakeholder is aware of our purpose and mission and we actively involve them in the process by meeting monthly with our school leadership team, teachers, and school staff. Parents and students are invited to our SAC meetings. We actively reach out to local businesses and community leaders to build relationships that help support students and staff in a variety of ways.

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))

We will regularly monitor the academic performance of our students through scheduled data meetings with teachers, grade levels, departments, district coaches, and district staff. We will evaluate the

implementation of identified strategies, programs, and interventions. To improve strategies, we will reflect on the implemented strategies, reassess our plan, and make adjustments as needed.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Native American Students (AMI) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	42	40	142
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	36	20	82
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	10	15	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	20	11	66
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	54	69	188
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	36	36	147
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	54	69	188

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	73	77	243

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	30	43	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	26	33	73
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5	15	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	7	18	46
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	66	80	195
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	67	71	197
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	66	80	195

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	77	91	235

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	30	43	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	26	33	73
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5	15	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	7	18	46
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	66	80	195
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	67	71	197
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	66	80	195

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	77	91	235

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	55	58	49	53	55	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				48			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			32		
Math Achievement*	68	71	56	57	36	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				60			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			27		
Science Achievement*	60	61	49	58	63	53	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	70	68	74	66	58	63		
Middle School Acceleration	51	66	73	57	54	49	70		
Graduation Rate					61	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress		31	40	46	66	76	73		

* 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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54

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	537
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
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	30	Yes	4	2
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	43			
HSP	63			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	52			

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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	58			
AMI	46			
ASN	71			
BLK	41			
HSP	59			

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	56			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	48			

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	55			68			60	73	51			
SWD	26			36			22	35	33		5	
ELL	18			64			20				3	
AMI												
ASN	47			79			80				3	
BLK	38			45			38	61	31		5	
HSP	60			70			63	85	35		5	
MUL	61			79			64	87	63		5	
PAC												
WHT	59			71			66	72	54		5	
FRL	48			61			49	66	38		5	

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	53	48	39	57	60	45	58	74	57			46
SWD	20	32	31	24	45	39	23	39	25			
ELL	32	57	73	59	76	50		69				46
AMI	27	55		45	55							
ASN	75	58		75	75							

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	33	39	28	37	54	41	37	46	58			
HSP	59	57	53	64	61	33	67	70	71			
MUL	63	46	33	65	63	43	62	86	45			
PAC												
WHT	57	49	41	60	61	52	64	79	56			
FRL	43	44	34	46	55	47	48	65	46			

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	55	48	32	50	36	27	55	63	70			73
SWD	25	34	26	24	27	23	31	33	50			
ELL	21	40	25	42	30							73
AMI	38	20		38	30							
ASN	79	62		62	33							
BLK	38	36	28	30	23	18	49	52	50			
HSP	56	49	21	51	32	21	50	61	82			
MUL	62	56	46	61	39	25	57	86	82			
PAC												
WHT	59	52	36	55	40	34	57	63	71			
FRL	44	42	33	40	30	21	44	52	64			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	50%	54%	-4%	47%	3%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	57%	-4%	47%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	57%	-4%	47%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	62%	65%	-3%	54%	8%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	75%	-1%	48%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	67%	69%	-2%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	44%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	59%	38%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	61%	34%	48%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	70%	2%	66%	6%

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.

Area of lowest performance is in ELA achievement. The contributing factors included turnover of instructional staff in ELA, new curricula and assessment expectations and a need for more focused professional development.

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

The greater decline was in subgroups of students with disabilities and minorities.

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 trend of most concern is the gap between students with disabilities. However, there is an equal concern for students in minority categories.

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

There was a significant increase in achievement amongst our Hispanic student population. These students benefitted from the same strategies that the other subgroups students received.

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

Our areas of concern continue to be students with disabilities and African American students.

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

Our priorities are for our African American students, our students with disabilities, and our economically disadvantaged students to demonstrate achievement more in line with their peers. In addition, we continue to focus on school culture and climate.

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Shoal River Middle School will address positive school culture and environment by implementing the following:

Creating a safe environment in which students can learn and grow.

Setting expectations of excellence and quality in student learning and achievement.

Valuing every student's ability to learn.

Parents, teachers, and staff make decisions based on what is in the best interest and the welfare of students.

Reading Strategies will be used across the core curriculum areas.

Recognizing diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds.

Communicating effectively with students, educators, parents, administrators, school board members, and others in the community.

Continuing professional development.

Implementing B.E.S.T (Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking) based curriculum.

SRMS will provide required school supplies to all students free of cost to ensure all students will have what they need to be successful.

Saturday Homework will be held monthly at the school and other community sites

Establishing a robust PTO to increase parent involvement.

Recognizing students through the "MUSTANG STAR" program. Students can be nominated by teachers and staff for outstanding character.

Providing a "Community Closet" for students that may need help getting basic hygiene necessities.

Administrative Team will serve as instruction leaders.

Technology will be used throughout the curriculum.

SRMS will provide a New Teacher Program to help develop our new teachers.

Detailed agendas will document all meetings on campus to provide easy access for all faculty and staff to all necessary information.

A new teachers lounge was created in the spring to provide another location for collegial communication and team bonding.

A new discipline office was created to provide a central location for teachers to send students exhibiting negative behaviors.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We are looking for continued reduction in discipline schoolwide as well as an increase in student involvement in extra curricular activities.

Monitoring:

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

We observe discipline referrals monthly as well as monitor student involvement in outside activities sponsored by the school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Driver (driverj@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.)

Discipline is being improved through continued progressive and restorative discipline practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Consistent discipline practices have decreased repeat infractions. Restorative discipline practices have

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.

Continue to build upon Restorative Discipline group book study from last year, offer professional development for teachers on school culture and restorative discipline.

Person Responsible: Jason Driver (driverj@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: May 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After reviewing data, our ESSA Subgroup-Students with Disabilities was selected because it is below 41% in the current year with a Federal Index-Students with Disabilities at 31%. Selecting this subgroup as an area of focus will provide our school with an opportunity to study, implement, and develop best practices for teaching not only the SWD group, but also every student in our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ESSA Subgroup-Student with Disabilities will hit the target of Federal Index-Students with Disabilities ABOVE 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Our Area of Focus, ESSA Subgroup-Students with Disabilities will be monitored by identifying and implementing high-effect strategies that will help strengthen students foundational skills in Math and Reading.

Shoal River will be using collaboration among ESE, Intensive and Core teachers, and the Instructional Coaches to analyze data, study best practices, and to select and provide explicit instruction in order to increase achievement for the SWD students in Math and ELA.

This group of educators will use research based, high-effective size strategies and the Gradual Release Model to teach, monitor and practice the use of the strategies during whole group and small group instruction. ESE teachers will effectively use the Learning Strategies class to implement small and whole group instruction in order to support the general education curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Driver (driverj@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.)

In ELA, we will identify high-effect size strategies to help students strengthen their comprehension skills of grade-level texts. These strategies should include the Chunking the Text Strategy, the Summarizing Strategy and the use of Graphic and Semantic Organizers. Teachers will identify and implement best practices for working with students to expand their vocabulary and general knowledge in order to aid in comprehension of grade-level text. These best practices should include Frayer models, paired text, short video clips, and content building writing activities from the book *The Writing Revolution*.

In Math, we will identify and implement high-effect size strategies that help students strengthen foundational math skills. These strategies should include the CUBE strategy, Solve a Simpler Problem strategy, and the Draw a Picture or Make a Model strategy. The ESE team and classroom teachers will collaborate to determine the best use of the i-Ready and IXL programs for instruction and remediation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Purposefully integrate the six B.E.S.T. ELA Expectations into standards-based lessons and tasks.

Implement the gradual release model within interactive whole group instruction. I do (teacher modeling), We do (teacher-guided and student interactive whole group instruction), You do it together (student collaboration with teacher assistance, as needed), You do it alone (student demonstrates skill/concept independently)

Deliver instruction that fosters student engagement via meaningful interactions with text(s) by strategically integrating components of close reading, leading to a culminating task. Utilize text analysis strategies to include purposeful text-dependent questions, text-marking, annotating, writing through reading, and purposeful student talk. Utilize approved instructional resources such as myPerspectives and i-Ready (Grades 6-8) to plan targeted interactive whole group instruction that promotes comprehension and analysis of complex text(s).

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 create a schedule for daily classes reflecting pacing that facilitates the teaching of the strategies and incorporates best practices into Learning Strategies classes. ESE students will follow the daily schedules in the classes, participate in lessons to learn about the strategies, and apply them to class work in all of their appropriate.

Teachers will use the identified strategies and best practices in their Gradual Release lessons and reflect upon their use and effectiveness in ESE, Department and Grade Level monthly meetings Students will use the strategies in their lessons and reflect upon their own learning, advocate for their learning by participating in small group and one-on-one assistance during the Learning Strategies classes.

Teachers will follow the plan for using i-Ready program for teaching and remediation with the ESE students. Students on the Individualized Learning Path lessons will have their work monitored so that lessons with yellow or red flags will lead to small group or one-on-one re-teaching by the Core or ESE teacher. Students will complete i-Ready lessons as appropriate on paper or computerized and will advocate for themselves when presented with confusing concepts by reaching out for help from the Core or ESE teacher.

Person Responsible: Jason Driver (driverj@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: May 2024

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**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA****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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

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: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	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