Okaloosa County School District

Wright Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wright Elementary School

305 LANG RD, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547

[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.

To inspire a lifelong passion for learning while providing a welcoming, safe, and nurturing environment for all stakeholders. We are READY!

Provide the school's vision statement.

R – Respectful and Responsible – norms established that build positive relationships and a shared commitment to the academic and social/emotional growth of Wright Elementary students

E – Engaged – multiple avenues for open communication among staff and among all stakeholders; meaningful parent involvement opportunities through consistent communication and invitation (scheduled curriculum nights, parent/family activities, student activities, and events throughout the school year; diversity of cultures is recognized and included; opportunities for community/local business involvement

A – Accountable – professional development that assists staff in developing skills to create and support and positive school climate; development of short- and long-range plans for visible improvements to the campus

D – Dependable – calendar of activities and events maintained and provided as relevant to staff, families; routines that serve as part of our school culture that staff and families know they can depend on

Y – Your personal best – recognizing and celebrating staff members, students; support and encouragement for staff-selected personal/ professional development that contributes to the mission of Wright Elementary.

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
Boyd, Suzanne	Principal	Provide instructional leadership and maintain a safe school environment by: following policies and procedures, maintaining school budget, developing school master schedule and calendar, hiring and evaluating staff, overseeing ESE and Title I departments, overseeing implementation of adopted curriculum, monitoring student achievement and behavior, engaging parents, developing leaders within the school staff.
Feldman, Laurie	Assistant Principal	Coordinating and implementing new teacher training and support/mentoring, developing master class lists/groups in FOCUS information system, monitoring student academics and behavior, evaluating staff, monitoring facilities, safety.
Maxey, Ryan	Teacher, ESE	Provides leadership in ESE department through previous ESE experience. Collaborates with classroom teachers and other ESE teachers to schedule and implement services for students with IEPs. Serves on MTSS committee and works cooperatively with MTSS team to identify strategies and provide support for students. Assists with testing and scheduling of testing.
Raines, Mary	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development and support in the area of ELA. Meets with teachers to develop lesson plans and to demonstrate model lessons; to provide instruction and assistance with benchmarks/standards, assessments, balanced literacy model. Meets with administration weekly and assists with data collection and review and planning for improvement.

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.

Spring needs assessments conducted by instructional coaches for teachers
March/April - Leadership Team met with ELA and Math Coach to review the SPP for the 2022-2023 school year.
May – SPP team members attended a work session at the District Office.
May/June – small group session to review/revise ELA
July – small group session to review/revise Math, Science
July – email review by teachers/staff
July-September - small group discussions, admin team review
August/September – School Advisory Council review/approval

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))

Wright Elementary School's SIP will be monitored as follows:
Schoolwide - PM1, PM2, PM3 (FAST/STAR and i-Ready Diagnostic)
Grade level wide - PM1, PM2, PM3, common assessments (Benchmark Advance), PLC meetings
Classroom level - PM1, PM2, PM3, formative and summative assessments (grade level team meetings, individual data chats as scheduled)
Subgroups- continuous monitoring with ESE and Title through weekly MTSS meetings

Data will be disaggregated to focus on subgroup performance and further identify any strengths and needs. Based on data review, continued interventions will be maintained or modified.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	76%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: 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	26	25	20	8	16	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	6	3	4	0	0	0	27
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	5	16	15	3	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	9	5	6	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	31	38	40	27	29	0	0	0	165
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	24	15	31	28	25	0	0	0	123
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	31	38	40	27	29	0	0	0	165

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	32	41	47	31	30	0	0	0	181

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	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	1	21	21	14	15	15	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	7	0	0	5	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	15	9	14	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	1	0	9	12	6	12	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	24	27	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	19	26	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	25	24	27	0	0	0	79

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	1	0	12	28	25	33	0	0	0	99

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	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	21	21	14	15	15	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	7	0	0	5	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	15	9	14	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	1	0	9	12	6	12	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	24	27	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	19	26	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	25	24	27	0	0	0	79

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	1	0	12	28	25	33	0	0	0	99

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	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5

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*	45	59	53	44	61	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				60			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			58		
Math Achievement*	56	65	59	53	47	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				60			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			35		
Science Achievement*	48	57	54	37	63	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					61	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	60	59	66			50		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	251
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

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	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	2	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	41			

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	60			
PAC				
WHT	61			
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	45			56			48					61
SWD	15			29			17				4	
ELL	39			47			36				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			44							3	
HSP	41			45			38				5	59
MUL	41			47							2	
PAC												
WHT	48			69			59				5	65
FRL	41			52			45				5	59

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	44	60	48	53	60	42	37					66
SWD	20	56	58	25	44	50	0					
ELL	33	49	42	46	50	33	28					66
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	43	69		46	58							
HSP	35	47	44	42	46	28	23					65
MUL	55	71		45	67							
PAC												
WHT	50	69	64	65	73		47					
FRL	42	56	41	49	57	48	33					67

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	53	63	58	52	51	35	58					50
SWD	17	50	56	28	48	44	26					35
ELL	35	67	58	44	54	55	32					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56			41			36					
HSP	34	48	55	42	48	50	35					50
MUL	68			46								
PAC												
WHT	62	66		65	63		76					60
FRL	52	62	58	53	48	31	51					58

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	48%	61%	-13%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	67%	-26%	58%	-17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	36%	55%	-19%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	65%	-22%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	72%	-16%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	63%	-3%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	51%	-10%

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.

Students with disabilities (SWDs) showed the lowest performance with 36% proficient. Contributing factors may include: transition of new teachers in core subject areas; lack of reading endorsed teachers has put a strain on Title I and ESE departments.

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

Greatest decline from prior year data:
ELA Achievement dropped from 53% proficient to 44% proficient (9 point drop);
ELA Lowest 25th percentile drop from 58% to 48% (10 point drop);
Science (5th grade) drop from 58% proficient to 37% proficient
Contributing factors may include the change in instructional staffing (many new teachers), need for more reading endorsed teachers, change in demographics (increased in number of ELLs and percent of free/reduced meals students); the effects of COVID (school closures, online school, etc.) may also be considered as contributing factors.

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.

Greatest gap when compared:
ELA Lowest 25th percentile - contributing factors may include increase in new teachers at the school, need for more reading endorsed teachers. Title I teaching staff also experienced turnover.

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

Math achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25th percentile also showed improvement from the previous year, with the greatest improvement showing in learning gains (9 points). Actions to impact this area include: use of instructional coach to support professional learning and PLCs, consistency of math teaching staff (not as much turnover of staff in math).

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

Areas of concern include:
96 students absent 10 or more days of the school year
165 students identified as having a substantial reading deficiency
181 students with two or more EWS indicators

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

1 - ELA proficiency - increase percentage of students identified as proficient; if not proficient, increase by at least a year's worth of growth
2 - Decrease the overall number of students identified as having a substantial reading deficiency by PM3 (progress monitoring session 3 in the spring)
3 - Improve overall student attendance by decreasing the number of students with 10 or more absences.

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.

We believe that student attendance is directly related to the positive culture and environment of our school. Last year, the data demonstrated a large number of students absent 10 or more days for the school year.

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

Decrease by at least 30% the number of students who are absent 10 or more days during the school year. Last year, 96 students fit this criteria, so our goal is to drop the number absent 10 or more days 67 or fewer.

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

Monitoring will occur during our MTSS team meetings.
Monitoring will be shared with staff, students (intercom announcement positive shout outs), and in parent newsletters (monthly attendance focus).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Boyd (boyds@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.)

1 - Because attendance is directly related to achievement, the Literacy Leadership Team will receive and analyze attendance data to look for patterns and suggest ongoing strategies.
2 - Teachers will monitor their students' attendance and reach out to parents when a student has three or more absences in a month. Additionally, our STP (Student Training Program) monitor is assigned to make parent contacts also regarding student attendance.
3 - Our MTSS team (meets weekly) will monitor attendance data and ensure parents are contacted regarding attendance concerns.
4 - A reward system will be established for students that aligns with our positive behavior system (weekly rewards, "dolphin dollars," positive intercom announcements).

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

"What gets recognized gets repeated." Purposeful attention paid to improving and recognizing student attendance will result in students wanting to attend more consistently. Our team wishes to purposefully recognize student attendance in positive ways that will result in a more positive culture and environment.

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.

Students with disabilities proficiency in ELA -
Less than 41% of our SWDs were proficient in reading/ELA. These students are not only part of our overall group, but they are also part of other subgroups (SWD, Lowest 25th percentile, learning gains).

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

50% or more of Wright's identified SWDs will be designated as proficient by PM3. Of those who are not proficient, we expect all students to make at least a year's growth as measured from PM1 to PM3.

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

Long term progress monitoring will occur starting with PM1, then compare to PM2 (December/January), then to PM3 (April/May 2024).
Short term monitoring will occur via classroom assessments (common assessments in ELA, Benchmark Advance), i-Ready student personalized path, and Standards Mastery (i-Ready).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Boyd (boyds@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.)

-Tier 1 Interactive whole group/small group instruction at rigorous grade level benchmarks (covering all areas as appropriate for grade level in all tiers of instruction - phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension)
-Tier 2 interventions in classroom, Title I, and ESE resource room that include explicit instruction of the benchmarks
Tier 3 interventions in classroom, Title I, and ESE resource room that include explicit instruction of the benchmarks
ESOL interpreters work daily with groups of identified students using ELA/Reading resources that support grade level curriculum (Benchmark Advance "frontloading" of material, Magnetic Reading) (Some SWDs are also ESOL students).
Before/During/After School tutoring small groups using evidence-based materials
PLCs of grade level/subject area teachers that focus on instructional strategies and use of common assessments; common assessments will then be analyzed by the PLC team to inform instruction.
Collaboration between ESE teachers and classroom teachers to ensure instruction is individualized for students.

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

Strong tier 1 instruction and collaboration among teachers will support student growth in ELA. Ensuring students are receiving explicit instruction for ELA with evidence based strategies and materials is our focus.

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

AREA OF FOCUS: TARGETED SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION
Percent at/above proficiency at each grade level on 2022-2023 FAST/STAR Reading PM3:
KG -39%; 1st grade - 38%; 2nd grade - 40%
i-Ready data (pending diagnostic completion Sept. 2023)
Area of Focus for grades K-2 is the provision of targeted and differentiated small group instruction in all ELA classrooms. With this focus, we can ensure that fluid groups of students are created in each classroom, and within these groups, students are provided individualized instruction using their most current data (including classroom assessments).

STRATEGIES/PRACTICES IN PLACE FOR THIS FOCUS:
Use of Magnetic Reading materials, Benchmark Advance Intervention resources, multi-sensory routines and strategies
For ELLs - small group support by interpreters that includes frontloading of instructional vocabulary and texts from Benchmark Advance ELA curriculum (use ELA pacing guide and collaboration/support from ELA teachers and instructional coach).
PLCs with teachers/ELA coach to monitor student performance and diagnostic data for short term and long term planning
ELA instructional coach to implement coaching cycles including a first grade (all ELA first grade teachers) cycle (primarily "newer" ELA teachers in first grade)

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

AREA OF FOCUS: TARGETED SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION
Percent at/above proficiency at each grade level on 2022-2023 FAST ELA PM3:
3rd grade - 36%; 4th grade - 41%; 5th grade - 49%.
i-Ready data (pending diagnostic completion Sept. 2023)

STRATEGIES/PRACTICES IN PLACE FOR THIS FOCUS:
Use of Magnetic Reading materials, Benchmark Advance Intervention resources
For ELLs - small group support by interpreters that includes frontloading of instructional vocabulary and texts from Benchmark Advance ELA curriculum (use ELA pacing guide and collaboration/support from ELA teachers and instructional coach).
PLCs with teachers/ELA coach to monitor student performance and diagnostic data for short term and long term planning

ELA instructional coach to implement coaching cycles including a first grade (all ELA first grade teachers) cycle (primarily "newer" ELA teachers in first grade)

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

Percent at/above proficiency at each grade level on 2022-2023 FAST/STAR Reading PM3:
KG -39%; 1st grade - 38%; 2nd grade - 40%
Our goal is that at least 62% of our students will score as proficient on the PM3 FAST/STAR assessment (April/May 2024).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Percent at/above proficiency at each grade level on 2022-2023 FAST ELA PM3:
3rd grade - 36%; 4th grade - 41%; 5th grade - 49%.
Our goal is that at least 62% of our students will score as proficient on the PM3 FAST/STAR assessment (April/May 2024).

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.

Short-term progress monitoring will occur through weekly literacy classroom walk throughs (conducted by school administration and shared/debriefed/reflected upon with Literacy Leadership Team and classroom teachers); gradebook analysis of unit assessments, monthly standards mastery through i-Ready reading, and data chats and PLCs with grade levels.
Long-term progress monitoring will occur during mid- and end-of-year assessments (FAST PM2 and FAST PM3, i-Ready D2 and i-Ready D3).

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boyd, Suzanne, boyds@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?

Classroom instructional practices that align to the science of reading (professional learning ongoing with our school-based full-time ELA instructional coach)
Benchmark Advance (Core ELA curriculum) to support instruction of the B.E.S.T. standards.
Magnetic Reading
i-Ready online program for remediation/acceleration of students based on their individual learning needs
Ready Teacher Toolbox, i-Ready Tools for Instruction
Phonics for Reading (tier 3 for 3rd-5th only)
Student engagement strategies implemented by teachers

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?

Benchmark Advance is our state and district adopted ELA curriculum.
i-Ready, Phonics for Reading, Tools for Instruction, and Magnetic Reading are district approved resources to support reading instruction.
Implementation of these resources with consistent fidelity will lead to growth in student ELA performance.

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
AREA OF FOCUS: TARGETED SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION Literacy Leadership - monthly team meetings that include grade level representatives to report on/monitor progress of grade level small group instruction. Administrators will report data/observations regarding small group instruction (to include reflection and provision of feedback to teachers). Team will ensure resources, materials, and schedules support literacy instruction. Literacy Coaching - establishment of ongoing professional learning that supports science of reading-based literacy instruction and provides the knowledge and resources to assist teachers in implementing effective literacy instructional blocks. Three school-based central message professional learnings will be scheduled throughout the school year and delivered to teachers by grade level. Teachers will also be provided time each week for PLC meetings with the instructional coach by grade level. Assessment - Short term progress monitoring will occur through Benchmark Advance assessments and i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments. Long term progress monitoring will occur through F.A.S.T./STAR PM1 and PM2 and i-Ready D1 and D2. Professional Learning - Wright has a full time ELA instructional coach who implements ongoing professional learning to grade levels, small groups, the faculty, and one on one. A specific focus this year will be a grade level (first grade) ELA coach cycle with all the first grade ELA teachers.	Boyd, Suzanne, boyds@okaloosaschools.com

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.

School webpage - www.okaloosaschools.com/wright
It is important to Wright Elementary staff that we share whole group and subgroup data with our stakeholders.
Wright Elementary will share and disseminate information to our stakeholders via the following methods:
Staff - faculty meetings, grade chair meetings, leadership team meetings, grade level meetings/PLCs
Students/families/community - School Advisory Council meetings, parent engagement events, PTO meetings, through website and social media, school newsletters. Material will be provided in translated format when appropriate, due to Wright Elementary School's growing English Language Learner population.

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))

School webpage - www.okaloosaschools.com/wright
Following our 2023 - 2024 Parent/Family Engagement Plan, Wright Elementary will purposely schedule events and activities throughout the school year. These events will include but are not limited to:
Back to school orientation
Fall open house
Curriculum nights - Reading and Math/Science
Parent/Teacher conference days, printed report cards
Veterans Day activities
Literacy Week events
Purple Star School activities
PTO family engagement events
Field Days and fun runs
Holiday events (i.e., Thanksgiving family lunch)
Before/During/After School Tutoring
Specific communication between Title I teachers and families regarding student progress and ways to support students

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))

Academic program will be strengthened by increasing/improving teacher retention and teacher proficiency in ELA (specifically, increasing the number of reading endorsed teachers).
Title I program - has had a change in teacher staffing to now include 4 full time teachers (two for ELA and two for Math)
ESE program - has had an increase in ESE parapros to allow for more small group support and student mainstreaming from our self-contained behavior support unit
A STEM/STEAM lab is being added for the 2023-2024 school year that will become part of the special areas (PE, Music) rotation for students in grades 1 - 5. Students will experience science hands on activities, arts, and other STEAM related activities during their time in the rotation.

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))

This plan will be considered when developing our new 2023-2024 PFEP (Title I Parent Family Engagement Plan) to ensure we provide the opportunity for involvement to all stakeholders to the greatest extent possible.

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))

Wright Elementary has a full-time school-based RISE program counselor (RISE - Resiliency Increasing Skills and Education) and an itinerant (one day per week) school social worker. We use our MTSS team and meetings as the avenue through which students are recommended for support and services. Beginning with the 2022-2023 school year, Wright also has a HOPE Squad, which is a school-based peer-to-peer suicide prevention program. Select 4th and 5th graders are HOPE Squad members and are

trained (at an age-appropriate level) to report concerns to adults.
Our monthly threat assessment team meeting also lead to referrals for mental health services.
Any staff member can express concern for a student and share information with our MTSS team.

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))

Beginning with the 2023-2024 school year, Wright Elementary will have a STEM lab that will be part of the weekly rotation for classes (PE, Music, STEM) in grades 1 - 5. Fourth and fifth grade teachers and other staff members were trained over the summer to implement STEM curriculum. Additionally, a staff member is assigned as the STEM parapro and will be facilitating STEM activities for students.
Wright Elementary is investigating the idea of taking 4th and 5th graders on a field trip to visit the Okaloosa Technical College, so they can be made aware of the opportunities ahead of them as they move toward high 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).

Tier 1 behavior classroom management occurs at the classroom level. When teachers identify students in need of supports beyond tier 1, the needs are discussed and addressed within our weekly MTSS meetings. Tier 2 and/or tier 3 interventions are planned for during these MTSS meetings. If a student continues to demonstrate a need for interventions of a greater intensity, the following resources are available to be engaged: school based mental health counseling, behavior interventionist, behavior analyst, development of an FBA/BIP.

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))

Professional Learning (PL) is provided for teachers by grade level at least three times per year under the direction of our instructional coaches. Wright Elementary has a full time ELA instructional coach and a part time (3 days per week) math instructional coach. Grade levels meet as PLCs with coaches to plan instruction, analyze data including that from common assessments, and share ideas and strategies. For the 2023-2024 school year, Wright Elementary will continue growing its base of reading endorsed teachers by supporting professional learning and teachers' decisions to participate in the reading endorsement assessment.

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))

Wright Elementary hosts Kindergarten Kickstart, a 4 day summer program for incoming kindergarten students. This program helps us to orient the new students to what a day at school is like. Routines and procedures are introduced and practiced.

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: 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