Lula J. Edge Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lula J. Edge Elementary School

300 HIGHWAY 85 N, Niceville, FL 32578

[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.

Our District has a shared Mission to place 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.

We work together to inform our decisions using data to equip and empower educators with the research and resources they need to inspire all students and support Edge families and stakeholders in their journey to excel. #GrowingLeaders

Our school's vision is that we encourage all members of the Edge community to R.O.A.R.
We are a school filled with traditions, and continue to encourage and excel in the area of academic excellence. As Edge Tigers we expect all students to show Respect, Ownership, Acts of Kindness and Responsibilities throughout their everyday lives in school and in the greater community. Our students and staff follow a R.O.A.R. matrix in all areas of our campus and posters are displayed as reminders around the school campus.

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
Kearley, Melissa	Principal	
Anderson, Kathy	Assistant Principal	
Early, Kristen	Teacher, ESE	

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.

January-March 2023 Parent Climate Survey

March 2023 Teacher Survey from Instructional Coaches

April-May 2023 Feedback from SAC and Grdae Levels

April-May 2023 Assemble and Meet with the 23-24 SPP Team (listed above), Review Template and Focus Areas

June 2023 Begin drafting the SPP with different curriclum expert groups

July 2023 Present to Instructional Coaches for Review and Feedback

July 31, 2023 SPP Due in Sharepoint

August 2023 Present Draft to teachers for feedback and clarifications, SPP will be reviewed by the Curriculum and Instruction Dept.

September 2023 Final SPP Presented to the 23-24 SAC for Signature

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))

Before school common planning time with the ESE teacher and grade levels
Differentiated small group instruction, monitored during weekly walkthroughs
Student accountability and SMART goals
Quarterly data analysis
Orten Gillingham approach to phonics and phonemic awareness evident through lesson planning and student work samples

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	8	10	14	8	6	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	3	2	12	6	2	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	2	1	0	6	3	3	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	1	7	18	17	10	9	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	21	7	9	9	8	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	18	17	10	9	0	0	0	62

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	2	12	19	21	11	10	0	0	0	75

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	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	15	14	13	7	8	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	15	6	4	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	7	2	7	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	8	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	6	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	11	13	8	0	0	0	33

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	1	5	15	15	12	0	0	0	48

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	15	14	13	7	8	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	15	6	4	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	7	2	7	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	8	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	7	6	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	11	13	8	0	0	0	33

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	1	5	15	15	12	0	0	0	48

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	62	59	53	70	61	56	77		
ELA Learning Gains				70			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			22		
Math Achievement*	71	65	59	73	47	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				62			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			32		
Science Achievement*	72	57	54	71	63	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					61	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	265
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	67			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	54			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	65			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	49			

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	62			71			72					
SWD	37			41			42				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			31							2	
HSP	53			53							2	
MUL	69			76			70				4	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	63			74			73				4	
FRL	52			60			53				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	70	70	36	73	62	47	71					
SWD	30	41	29	42	44	23	33					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			31	50							
HSP	68	56		73	63							
MUL	78	82		72	82		92					
PAC												
WHT	69	72	48	76	59	48	69					
FRL	54	58	22	57	52	40	60					

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	77	60	22	71	55	32	72					
SWD	49	27	18	51	27		29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	60			47								
HSP	79			68								
MUL	78			74								
PAC												
WHT	77	66	33	72	56	33	75					
FRL	56	38		52	38		48					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	67%	2%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	55%	4%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	65%	3%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	72%	5%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	63%	4%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	57%	12%	51%	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.

Our SWD subgroup is defined as having below 41% proficiency as designated on the Federal Point Index. Math (23%) and ELA (29%) LG for the Lowest 25% of the SWD population.

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

The overall ELA Achievement for SWD dropped from 49% to 30% and overall Math 51% to 42%

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.

With the implementation of the new curriculum, all of our subgroup areas exceeded the state averages.

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

Our ELA and Math Learning Gains were areas of improvement. During the school based Acceleration Station time students receive addition remediation according to their iReady data.

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

62 students were identified as having a substantial reading deficiency during the 22-23 SY. As a school we are going to ensure that all of these families receive the information for the new world scholarship and that the teachers are providing intensive individual instruction for these students.

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

Common Planning time with the ESE Team
Technology Integration
Closer Look at Instructional Goals for SWD
Meeting the students where they are instructionally
Continuous Data Analysis

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 Other

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 school counselor is going to schedule sessions with classes focused around character development. He goal is to keep a pulse on the culture and environment of the school setting specifically with our SWD population. We are going to meet weekly to discuss and follow-up on some of the needs of our school.

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

Create SMART Goals with students and pre and post assessments
Using our PAWS system in the lunchroom to monitor behavior and reward classroom groups who are working together to build a positive community within different school environments.

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

Weekly meeting check-ins
Scheduled lessons

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Anderson (kathy.anderson@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.)

PBIS is a way to recognize the positive behaviors that students are displaying around the school. Within our ROAR matrix students are given examples of what they should look like and sound like in the different areas of the classroom.

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

Through our positive behavior intervention systems the students are encouraged and rewarded for their positive behavior.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

Our SWD subgroup is defined as having below 41% proficiency as designated on the federal point index.

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

Level 1 ELA decreased to under 50
Level 1 Math decreased to under 45
Absent 10% decreased to under 40
SMART Goals set with the students will help the teacher and student progress monitor these goals.

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

Planning time provided to the teachers to meet with the ESE department to discuss strategies and progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Early (earlyk@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.)

Orton-Gillingham will be used to support phonics instruction while the SWD are in the resource room. The time in the resource room is established by the IEP team and monitored weekly by the resource teacher using the OG monitoring tools.

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

Area of focus identified by our 21-22 data. The data showed significant gaps in the phonics and phonemic awareness concepts for our SWD which leads directly into their vocabulary and comprehension knowledge.

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).

Data determined out ESSA sub-group
Review of processes with our ESE staff
Develop Plan for movement forward
Schedule planning time for teachers to meet to discuss specific student needs and pay for teacher/sub time before/during/after school.