

Flagler Schools

Old Kings Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

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: 11/30/2018

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Flagler County Public Schools ensures educational success through high expectations and innovative thinking in a safe learning environment to empower students to reach their full potential as responsible, ethical, and productive citizens in a diverse and changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a courageous, innovative leader in education, Flagler County Public Schools will be the Nation's premier learning organization where ALL students graduate as socially responsible citizens with the skills necessary to reach their maximum potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crooke, Katherine	Principal	Daily Operations
Fries, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Curriculum & Instruction/ Exceptional Student Education
Schell, Nick	Assistant Principal	Discipline and Student Services
Chieppa, Toni	Instructional Coach	K-6 Math & Science Coach
Hardesty, Kathryn	Instructional Coach	3-6 Literacy Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 11/30/2018, Katherine Crooke

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Demographic Data

2020-21 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 .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/30/2020

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	
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

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	
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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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%				
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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					
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						

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
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	
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 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 consistently implement 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?

OKES will focus on attendance and positive behavior interventions.

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. Other specifically relating to Literacy & High Expectations

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our 2018-2019 FSA data, our overall learning gains for our Bottom Quartile are the lowest they have been over a span of 4 years. Although grades 3 and 6 are performing higher than the state, we are increasing at a slower pace.

Measureable Outcome: If OKES is strategic in scheduling weekly PLCs with a focus on systematic phonics instruction, standards-based instruction for core subjects and cross-curricular writing; then we will see and increase of 5 percentage points among our Bottom Quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathryn Hardesty (hardestyk@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Each grade level will meet weekly to collaborate, review ongoing data, and plan for the delivery of differentiated, standards-based instruction in order to best meet the needs of our Bottom Quartile and Students with Disabilities through.

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 Steps to Implement

1. Analyze most recent data for SWD and BQ
2. Plan purposeful, data-driven PLCs that will provide support for teachers and allow them to effectively deliver differentiated, standards-based instruction.
3. Continue to review student data, specifically SWD and BQ
4. Adjust instructional practices as needed.
5. Offer continuous coaching support for teachers as a follow up to PLC.

Person Responsible Kathryn Hardesty (hardestyk@flaglerschools.com)

#2. Other specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Old Kings will improve their status in the state wide leveled PBIS system from Bronze to Silver. PBIS has a direct correlation to attendance, discipline, and overall student achievement.

Measureable Outcome: Old Kings will have enhanced Implementation of tiered interventions and emphasis of PBIS initiatives to improve students outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nick Schell (schelln@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of PBIS strategies with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Old Kings understands that attendance and discipline has a direct connection to student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

- Monthly meeting for PBIS core team and full team. - Schell
- Fidelity in implementation of reward system for student positive behavior. - Schell & Core SS Team
- Fidelity in implementation of the biweekly character education lessons in every class. - Hall and Reynolds

Person Responsible Nick Schell (schelln@flaglerschools.com)

#3. Other specifically relating to Graduation Rate

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our 2018-2019 FSA data, our math gains, specifically for our Bottom Quartile, were 43% which is down by 12 percentage points from 2017-18 (55%). Our math learning gains in the subgroup for SWD was 33% which is also down from 46% the year prior (-13).
 After review of our small group instructional practices, we noticed that our current practice was insufficient with regard to increasing student achievement. Additionally, we noticed that our tiered instruction was not appropriately aligned to core.

If OKES is strategic in selecting aligned interventions for tiered support, our differentiated, small-group instruction will be more effective as it relates to increasing student achievement.

Measureable Outcome: OKES will implement Ready MAFS for Tier 1 Instruction, Ready Reteach for Tier 2 Instruction, and Tools for Instruction (determined by iReady diagnostic) for Tier 3.
 By aligning interventions, and improving differentiated instruction, we will see an increase in student growth among our Bottom Quartile and SWDs from 31% to 36%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: OKES will be intentional with regard to selecting interventions that will support and enhance core instruction.

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 Steps to Implement

1. OKES Admin and Coaches will review and revise current interventions.
2. OKES will implement a decision tree as a framework for teachers to reference when making instructional decisions to support student learning.
3. Teachers will monitor student progress on an ongoing basis to ensure the effectiveness and appropriateness of interventions.
4. Student data will be reviewed during PLCs with grade-level teams, admin, and coaches.
5. Interventions and instructional practices will be adjusted as need.

Person Responsible Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

#4. Other specifically relating to Acceleration

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to our 2018-19 FSA data, 27% of students scored a level 4 or 5 on the 5th grade Science which is down from the previous year by 5%.

Measureable Outcome: If instructional staff is intentional about selecting and incorporating weekly, standard-aligned science labs, then we will see a 5% increase in students scoring a level 4 or higher on the statewide science assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toni Chieppa (chieppat@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: 5th grade science teachers will meet weekly to discuss and plan for standard-aligned science labs. Coaching support will be available during and as a follow-up to review student work samples and to determine alignment and effectiveness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By exposing students to problems and activities beyond their previous year's achievement, we are expecting to increase their scale score.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet weekly with Administration and Science Coach to review and plan for upcoming labs.
2. Coaches and teachers will review work samples and student data (quarterly assessments) to determine next steps.
3. Instructional practices will be adjusted as needed based on student data.
4. Coaching support will be available on an ongoing basis.

Person Responsible Toni Chieppa (chieppat@flaglerschools.com)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our 2018-19 FSA data, our Students with Disabilities are the lowest performing subgroup with 31% of points earned.

Measureable Outcome: If OKES is strategic in selecting aligned interventions for our tiered support of SWD and our BQ, our differentiated, small group instruction will be more effective as it relates to increasing student achievement among this subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: By aligning interventions, and improving differentiated instruction, we will see an increase in student growth among our SWD from 31% to 36%.

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 Steps to Implement

1. OKES Admin and coaches will review and revise current interventions.
2. OKES will implement a decision tree to be used as a framework for teachers to reference when making instructional decisions to support student learning for our SWD and BQ.
3. Teachers will monitor student progress on an ongoing bases to ensure the effectiveness and appropriateness of interventions.
4. Student data will be reviewed during PLCs with grade-level teams, admin, and coaches.
5. Interventions and instructional practices will be adjusted as needed on an ongoing basis.

Person Responsible Jessica Fries (friesj@flaglerschools.com)

#6. Other specifically relating to Enhanced Acceleration

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Due to Covid-19, students have been out of the brick and mortar setting since March 2020. This has resulted in a critical need for accelerating student learning in effort to close achievement gaps.

Measureable Outcome: Students will show an increase in student growth on i-Ready from AP1 to AP2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathryn Hardesty (hardestyk@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will preview Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary during small group instruction in order to build background knowledge in an effort to accelerate learning. Additionally teachers will implement Number Talks in order to review math concepts and build conceptual understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: "The more students learn high. utility words, the better they will be able to comprehend text that contains those words or similar ones." (Steven Stall)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will receive training from Learning Focused relating to previewing strategies.
2. Lead teachers will mentor colleagues to build capacity.
3. Teachers will work collaboratively to create and build engaging and enriching small group activities to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary.
4. Admin will monitor fidelity of small group instruction.
5. Admin and coaches will utilize Ap1 and Ap2 comparison data to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

Person Responsible Kathryn Hardesty (hardestyk@flaglerschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All areas of need have been addressed in the focus areas listed above.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

As a school we will strive to involve stakeholders in the decisions making process by open dialogue and discussion through various parent and community committees established to improve student equity and overall education for ALL students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Literacy & High Expectations	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Early Warning System	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Graduation Rate	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Acceleration	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Enhanced Acceleration	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00