

Flagler Schools

Old Kings Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Old Kings Elementary School

301 OLD KINGS RD S, Flagler Beach, FL 32136

www.flaglerschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Katherine Crooke

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Flagler County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Old Kings Elementary School

301 OLD KINGS RD S, Flagler Beach, FL 32136

www.flaglerschools.com

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">49%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">25%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Flagler County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Old Kings Elementary School, a Marine Science Flagship School. We are committed to our vision of being a part of the Nation’s premier learning organization through exceptional student growth and performance.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a courageous, innovative leader in education, Old Kings Elementary will be a part of the Nation’s premier learning organization where ALL students are successful as socially responsible citizens with the skills necessary to reach their maximum potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schell, Nick	Assistant Principal	
Crooke, Katherine	Principal	
Fries, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Hardesty, Kathryn	Instructional Coach	
Chieppa, Toni	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	28	29	10	20	38	37	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	2	7	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	30	20	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	21	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	28	27	11	41	67	89	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	341

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	28	29	10	20	38	37	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	2	7	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	30	20	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	21	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	28	27	11	41	67	89	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	341

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	63%	57%	67%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	60%	58%	62%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	53%	53%	52%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	66%	63%	70%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	62%	62%	65%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	49%	51%	53%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	55%	53%	69%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (28)	0 (29)	0 (10)	0 (20)	0 (38)	0 (37)	0 (23)	0 (185)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (4)	0 (2)	0 (7)	0 (14)	0 (7)	0 (37)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (30)	0 (20)	0 (20)	0 (16)	0 (88)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (20)	0 (21)	0 (21)	0 (24)	0 (86)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	76%	68%	8%	58%	18%
	2018	74%	62%	12%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	60%	14%	58%	16%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	65%	58%	7%	56%	9%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	69%	62%	7%	54%	15%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	72%	5%	62%	15%
	2018	80%	69%	11%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	60%	18%	64%	14%
	2018	69%	63%	6%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	64%	58%	6%	60%	4%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	70%	67%	3%	55%	15%
	2018	78%	65%	13%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	53%	5%	53%	5%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	38	33	29	33	25	25				
ELL	64	57	67	65	72	55					
ASN	81	50		94	91						
BLK	58	50	45	53	46	54					

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	55	49	27	64	47	20					
MUL	64	65	58	57	51	29	45				
WHT	76	65	55	76	68	47	61				
FRL	63	56	50	65	60	39	45				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	38	36	32	46	48	33				
ELL	52	76	70	60	76						
ASN	85	70		100	90						
BLK	51	55		63	68						
HSP	50	57	53	69	74	68	39				
MUL	60	54		70	71	60	62				
WHT	67	58	52	74	68	49	61				
FRL	57	55	51	66	66	55	51				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	55	49	27	47	46	50				
ELL	62	55		57	64						
ASN	92			100							
BLK	61	60		58	50						
HSP	48	55	38	52	67	52	50				
MUL	66	71		66	73						
WHT	70	61	55	72	65	55	72				
FRL	59	57	49	60	60	52	63				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends.

SWD ELA Proficiency: 4th grade- 20%, 5th grade 23%, 6th grade 17% (Average 20%)
 SWD Math Proficiency: 4th grade- 20%, 5th grade 29%, 6th grade 20% (Average 23%)

Contributors were scheduling and planning with support staff and general education teachers and accountability with regard to reviewing data and providing targeted support from data. Additionally, it is important that we plan and use additional resources more targeted and strategic. We need to be better with consistently implementing research based resources aligned to grade-level expectations.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile went from 55% in 2018 to 43% in 2019 (-12%). Specially fourth grade. Additionally, our SWD subgroup showed a decline from 37% to 31%.

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.

We were below the state average in both our Math and ELA Lowest Quartile categories. ELA bottom quartile was 52% while the state was slightly above us with 53%. Math bottom quartile was 43% while the state was 51%. After reviewing the data, we found that we need to be more strategic in scheduling small group intervention time. Additionally, we need to do a better job streamlining and implementing research based instructional resources.

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

ELA Achievement went from 65% to 72% (+7). Last year we implemented coaching/modeling cycle that supported writing assignments that aligned to grade level standards in all subjects. In addition, teachers and coaching staff provided strategic instructional spiraling based on data analysis.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance below 90% (specifically in 4th and 5th grade).
Course failure in ELA or Math (3rd-5th grade).

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

1. Overall Learning Gains SWD
2. ELA and Math Learning Gains BQ
3. Science Proficiency .

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Graduation Rate
Rationale	<p>Our math gains, specifically lowest quartile, were 43% which is down by 12 percentage points from 2018 (55%). Our math learning gains in the subgroup SWD was 33% which is down from 36% the year prior.</p> <p>After careful review of our small group instructional practices, we noticed that our current practice was insufficient with regard to increasing student achievement.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	If Old Kings Elementary school is strategic in scheduling common planning and targeted supports to allow for a focus on differentiated small group instruction, than we will see an increase in student growth among our lowest quartile and Students with Disabilities from 31% to 36%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Each grade level will have common planning time to collaborate (GenEd teachers and ESE Support Facilitation Teachers) to review and make data-driven decisions on how to best meet the needs of all their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	"All teachers want their students' achievement levels to increase. Small group instruction and cooperative learning have a significant impact on student achievement" (Hattie, 2009)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional staff as well as admin. will review data during common planning and plan for targeted small group instruction. 2. Review data for BQ and SWD (Academic coaches, admin, and ESE teachers) 3. Provide ESE and GenEd teachers time to collaborate and plan for small group instruction/interventions (admin) <p>School Leadership will meet in December to review the effectiveness of our action steps. School Leadership will meet in January to complete the mid-year review in CIMS. School Leadership will meet in April/May to complete end of year review.</p>
Person Responsible	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

#2	
Title	Early Warning Systems (EWS)
Rationale	Target attendance for students below 90% 20 students in 3rd grade; 38 students in 4th grade; 37 students in 5th grade; 23 students in 6th grade). We know that attendance has a direct correlation to student achievement.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	If OKES provides monthly incentives for classes with the highest attendance per grade level then we will see a decrease in the number of students with attendance below 90% from an average of 29.5 to 25.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nick Schell (schelln@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	At then end of each month, admin and student services team will review data of class/student attendance. Classes in each grade level with the highest attendance rate will receive attendance incentives. We will also award the class with the highest in the entire school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to an article by the Department of Education (The Importance of School Attendance) "When students are absent for fewer days, their grades and reading skills often improve—even among those students who are struggling in school."
Action Step	
	Pull attendance reports monthly. Provide incentives for the class with the highest attendance per grade level and then overall school winner.
Description	School Leadership will meet in December to review the effectiveness of our action steps. School Leadership will meet in January to complete the mid-year review in CIMS. School Leadership will meet in April/May to complete end of year review.
Person Responsible	Nick Schell (schelln@flaglerschools.com)

#3	
Title	Literacy and High Expectations
Rationale	Our overall learning gains for the lowest quartile are the lowest they have been over the past four years. Although grades 3 and 6 are performing higher than the state, we are increasing at a slower pace.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	If Old Kings Elementary school is strategic in scheduling common planning and targeted supports to allow for a focus on differentiated small group instruction, than we will see an increase of 5 percentage points growth among our lowest quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Each grade level will have time to collaborate, review ongoing data, and plan for instruction in order to best meet the needs of our Lowest Quartile and Students with Disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	"All teachers want their students' achievement levels to increase. Small group instruction and cooperative learning have a significant impact on student achievement" (Hattie, 2009)
Action Step	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze student FSA data for SWD and LQ 2. Make adjustments to allow for targeted, small group instruction. 3. Coaching support will be offered during, and as a follow up to common planning.
Description	<p>School Leadership will meet in December to review the effectiveness of our action steps.</p> <p>School Leadership will meet in January to complete the mid-year review in CIMS.</p> <p>School Leadership will meet in April/May to complete end of year review.</p>
Person Responsible	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

#4	
Title	Acceleration
Rationale	27% of students scored a level 4 or 5 on the 5th grade Science FSA which is down from the previous year (2018 32%).
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	If instructional staff incorporate weekly science labs that are aligned to grade-level standards, then we will see an increase with percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Toni Chieppa (chieppat@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	5th grade science teachers will have common planning time (weekly) to review and edit upcoming labs as well as student work samples to ensure alignment to the grade-level standards. Coaching support will be provided during and as a follow-up to common planning. Additionally, teachers will review FSA reading data to determine literacy needs and supports so content can be mastered.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By exposing students to problems and exercises beyond their previous year's achievement level, we are expecting to increase their FSA scale score.
Action Step	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review labs and student work samples 2. Make adjustments to ensure alignment to ensure grade-level standard expectations.
Description	<p>School Leadership will meet in December to review the effectiveness of our action steps.</p> <p>School Leadership will meet in January to complete the mid-year review in CIMS.</p> <p>School Leadership will meet in April/May to complete end of year review.</p>
Person Responsible	Toni Chieppa (chieppat@flaglerschools.com)

#5	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Our Students with Disabilities category is the lowest performing subgroup with 31% of points earned.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	If Old Kings Elementary school is strategic in scheduling supports to allow for a focus on differentiated small group instruction, with clearly identified resources for interventions, than we will see an increase in student growth among our Students with Disabilities from 31% to 36%. This will be monitored and refined through classroom observations with school-wide feedback through department meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Each grade level will have common planning time to collaborate (GenEd teachers and ESE Support Facilitation Teachers) to review and make data-driven decisions on how to best meet the needs of all their students. Additionally we will revise and identify appropriate intervention programs to be used for Tiered Instruction and provide coaching support to for teachers on the implementation of those programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	"All teachers want their students' achievement levels to increase. Small group instruction and cooperative learning have a significant impact on student achievement" (Hattie, 2009)
Action Step	
	Instructional staff as well as admin. will review data during common planning and plan for targeted small group instruction.
Description	Review data for BQ and SWD (Academic coaches, admin, and ESE teachers) Provide ESE and GenEd teachers time to collaborate and plan for small group instruction/interventions (admin) School Leadership will meet in December to review the effectiveness of our action steps. School Leadership will meet in January to complete the mid-year review in CIMS. School Leadership will meet in April/May to complete end of year review.
Person Responsible	Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Old Kings is dedicated to building positive relationships with families to increase involvement, including efforts to communicate the school's mission and vision as well as keeping parents informed of their child's progress. The designated flagship program, Marine Science, was selected to expand and enhance community and parental involvement and positive relationships with all students. The program will focus on STEM activities within the school as well as incorporating community events.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Old Kings Elementary ensures the social-emotional needs of all students by providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil service through its guidance department and district level support. The Champion Mentoring program has been developed this year to work with students with additional needs. Students may have been identified in the MTSS department, classroom referrals, teacher referrals or parent communication.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Transition to Pre-K to Kindergarten: When a Pre K to Kindergarten student registers parents are given a date and time to meet with the kindergarten guidance counselor for an assessment and orientation. The parent and student are given a tour of the school. Kindergarten students and parents are also invited to come to meet the teacher the Friday before school starts so the student and parent can get familiar with the teacher.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

We have several routes to monitor the implementation of MTSS structures. We have monthly core MTSS team meetings to address how school the MTSS system is working. We look at school wide data to address what the needs are for the school. After looking at the data we discuss the best way to allocate our resources the address the needs of the school/grade level. Each teacher meets with the MTSS coordinator on a monthly basis to look at data and discuss the needs of their individual students. The data used is comprised of the following: classroom assessments, State-wide standardize assessments, performance matters. In addition, training's are held 3 times a year (after each progress monitoring window to look at grade level /classroom data. In these training's we discuss how each grade level is implementing their tier 2 & 3 interventions and grade level fidelity.

OKES used District Title II funds to support a writing curriculum that is research-based and relevant to current writing standards and expectations.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

n/a

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Graduation Rate	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Early Warning Systems (EWS)	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Literacy and High Expectations	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Acceleration	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00