

Flagler Schools

BUDDY TAYLOR MIDDLE SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 3
 - A. School Mission and Vision 3
 - B. School Leadership Team 3
 - C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 6
 - D. Demographic Data 7
 - E. Early Warning Systems 8
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 17
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 20
- III. Planning for Improvement 21
- IV. Positive Culture and Environment 29
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 31
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 35
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 37

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Flagler County School Board on Approved by Flagler County School Board on October 14, 2024.

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)
<p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 parents), 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://cims2.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)	
I.E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II.A-E: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Flagler 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 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.

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Mindi Scala

Position Title

Assistant Principal (Discipline/School Safety)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for developing and communicating clearly-defined, school-wide behavior expectations. Provide supports to students and families in transition as well as support students social-emotional wellbeing and mental health. As well as provide continued support to teachers, staff and students that maintains a safe learning environment throughout campus.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Cara Cronk

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for providing leadership that ensures high-quality instruction is aligned to academic standards and meets the needs of all students. Emphasizes the importance of school safety and maintains an environment that is both physically and emotionally safe for all stakeholders and aligns with the mission and vision of the school.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Rachel Bovino

Position Title

Assistant Principal (Curriculum)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for ensuring teachers are equipped with high-quality, standards-aligned curriculum and instruction that is challenging and accessible to all students in a way that is equitable and focuses on student achievement. Data analysis that is deliberate and provides real-time feedback that guides instructional practices, student supports, and professional learning.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Jaime Everage

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for providing ongoing training and support to all teachers on high impact, evidence-based instructional practices. Data analysis regularly, with teachers, to ensure goals are being met and if not that changes are made in instructional approaches to ensure that learning is accessible to all students.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Danielle Carlson

Position Title

Assistant Principal (ESE)

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Responsible for providing teachers with the support and resources needed to reduce the challenges and barriers that impact student success in effort to increase access to the content for all students. Also coordinate schoolwide testing and implementation of the school's ESOL and Title I program.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Josh Reinert

Position Title

Title 1 Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

No Answer Entered

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Parents and staff provide input through surveys. Input is also provided by all stakeholders at School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Data is collected and analyzed to identify common themes and areas of concern. The plan is developed and voted on by all stakeholders at the SAC meeting.

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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA 1114(b)(3))

In effort to ensure continuous improvement and fidelity of implementation, The SIP will be monitored quarterly by the leadership team. In addition, the leadership team will meet weekly to debrief data collected on instructional focus areas and early warning systems.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	MIDDLE/JR. HIGH 6-8
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	44.1%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	80.4%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENTS (AMI) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: B 2022-23: C* 2021-22: C 2020-21: 2019-20: C

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days							80	96	97	273
One or more suspensions							74	125	105	304
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							6	22	6	34
Course failure in Math							11	21	10	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							82	111	91	284
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							88	121	65	274
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2024-25

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							95	155	103	353

Current Year 2024-25

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained students: current year								3	8	7	18
Students retained two or more times								0	5	3	8

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last 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 school days							2	24	26	52
One or more suspensions							4	75	93	172
Course failure in ELA							4	9	6	19
Course failure in Math							4	9	6	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							157	127	154	438
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							106	107	82	295
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										763

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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							124	125	165	414

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year							4	9	6	19
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024			2023			2022**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	49	55	53	45	54	49	41	50	50
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **			21						
ELA Learning Gains	53	55	56				41		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	57	58	50				31		
Math Achievement *	57	62	60	57	60	56	56	32	36
Math Learning Gains	61	61	62				60		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	63	63	60				55		
Science Achievement *	52	57	51	47	57	49	42	65	53
Social Studies Achievement *	64	68	70	66	71	68	64	63	58
Graduation Rate								52	49
Middle School Acceleration	62	70	74	49	63	73	63	54	49
College and Career Readiness								72	70
ELP Progress	79	86	49	44	55	40	62	70	76

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	60%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	597
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	98%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
60%	53%	52%	50%		53%	53%

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 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%
Students With Disabilities	37%	Yes	5	
English Language Learners	54%	No		
Native American Students	51%	No		
Asian Students	70%	No		
Black/African American Students	45%	No		
Hispanic Students	62%	No		
Multiracial Students	55%	No		
White Students	60%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	21%	Yes	4	4
English Language Learners	44%	No		
Asian Students	68%	No		
Black/African American Students	37%	Yes	4	
Hispanic Students	56%	No		
Multiracial Students	54%	No		
White Students	57%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	26%	Yes	3	3
English Language Learners	40%	Yes	1	
Native American Students				
Asian Students	64%	No		
Black/African American Students	35%	Yes	3	
Hispanic Students	51%	No		
Multiracial Students	53%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	55%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	45%	No		

D. 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)

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	49%		53%	57%	57%	61%	63%	52%	64%	62%			79%
Students With Disabilities	19%		47%	51%	27%	57%	54%	17%	37%	22%			
English Language Learners	31%		55%	56%	49%	61%	75%	32%	59%	40%			79%
Native American Students	33%		64%		42%	64%							
Asian Students	64%		64%		77%	73%							
Black/African American Students	30%		46%	50%	34%	53%	59%	34%	43%	56%			
Hispanic Students	48%		54%	62%	56%	62%	71%	63%	62%	60%			77%
Multiracial Students	58%		54%	39%	61%	56%	46%	52%	77%	55%			
White Students	54%		54%	60%	62%	63%	63%	54%	69%	65%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	40%		49%	56%	48%	57%	61%	44%	52%	53%			82%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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%				57%			47%	66%	49%			44%
Students With Disabilities	11%				23%			7%	37%	29%			
English Language Learners	33%				53%			25%	54%				56%
Asian Students	61%				87%			70%	50%	73%			
Black/African American Students	32%				39%			26%	38%	48%			
Hispanic Students	43%				56%			48%	75%	40%			71%
Multiracial Students	46%				59%			46%	70%	48%			
White Students	50%				61%			53%	71%	50%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	37%				50%			42%	57%	39%			60%

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	41%		41%	31%	56%	60%	55%	42%	64%	63%			62%
Students With Disabilities	7%		25%	24%	16%	43%	44%	11%	30%	31%			
English Language Learners	17%		41%	48%	32%	49%	52%	10%	51%	40%			62%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	48%		52%		77%	65%		58%	67%	79%			
Black/African American Students	22%		32%	24%	33%	48%	42%	17%	48%	53%			
Hispanic Students	36%		41%	46%	53%	58%	60%	27%	69%	57%			63%
Multiracial Students	51%		43%	20%	62%	67%	61%	50%	63%	64%			
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	48%		43%	34%	64%	63%	63%	52%	68%	64%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	32%		35%	30%	48%	57%	54%	31%	59%	52%			50%

E. 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.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2023-24 SPRING				
		SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	6	51%	56%	-5%	54%	-3%
Ela	7	43%	51%	-8%	50%	-7%
Ela	8	49%	53%	-4%	51%	-2%
Math	6	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Math	7	31%	48%	-17%	47%	-16%
Math	8	57%	57%	0%	54%	3%
Science	8	50%	55%	-5%	45%	5%
Civics		62%	69%	-7%	67%	-5%
Algebra		96%	61%	35%	50%	46%
Geometry		100%	60%	40%	52%	48%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

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

Overall ELA: From 45% to 50%

- Keys to Literacy (KTL)
- Standards-based planning (Monthly)
- i-Ready Learning Path (During Eagle Advisory)
- PL Series (Writing Revolution/Scaffolding/Small Group Instruction/Questioning/Differentiation/Literacy Integration Across Content Areas/KTL Instructional Routine)

8th Science: From 47% to 51%

- Spiral review
- Standards-based planning (Monthly)
- Intentional planning for Q4
- 8th grade Intensive Reading curriculum- Rewards Science

Lowest Performance

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

7th Grade ELA: 43%

7th Grade Math: 31%

- Teacher turnover (7th Grade) - (3) Math/(2) ELA
- Highest repetitive suspensions (compared to 6th and 8th grade)
- Highest 2 or more EWS Indicators (compared to 6th and 8th grade)
- Highest 10 or more days absent (compared to 6th and 8th grade)

Greatest Decline

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

7th Grade ELA: From 47% to 43%

- Teacher turnover (7th Grade) - (2) ELA
- Highest repetitive suspensions (compared to 6th and 8th grade)
- Highest 2 or more EWS Indicators (compared to 6th and 8th grade)

- Highest 10 or more days absent (compared to 6th and 8th grade)

8th Math: From 70% to 57%

- Teacher turnover (8th Grade) - (2 sections) Math
- Looping teacher transferred, no looping classes

Greatest Gap

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.

7th Grade Math: 16 percentage points below the state.

BTMS: 31%

State: 47%

- Teacher turnover (7th Grade) - (3) Math/(2) ELA
- Highest repetitive suspensions (compared to 6th and 8th grade)
- Highest 2 or more EWS Indicators (compared to 6th and 8th grade)
- Highest 10 or more days absent (compared to 6th and 8th grade)

EWS Areas of Concern

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

There were 3,578 referrals with 675 students receiving a referral. Decreasing the number of office discipline referrals (ODR) is our area of concern as students miss important instructional time when in the student services office.

Highest Priorities

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

8th Grade - student growth and achievement in ELA/Math (23-24 7th Grade Cohort)

Students with Disabilities (SWD) scoring a Level 3 or higher

Literacy

EWS- decrease the number of referrals

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our 23-24 data indicated that 7th grade students show the greatest need for differentiated instruction and support in the 24-25 to recover learning loss due to high teacher turnover. The math department had three math teachers and two ELA teachers leave mid-year. This resulted in 66% of our 7th grade student population losing both an ELA and math teacher during the school year.

7th Grade ELA: 43% proficiency, down from 47% in 22-23.

7th Grade Math: 31% proficiency, down from 46% in 22-23.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

BTMS 8th Grade students will:

- Increase ELA proficiency by 7 points to 50%.
- Increase Math proficiency by 19 points to 50% (this cohort earned 46% proficiency during the 22-23 school year).

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

BTMS will focus on defining and modeling differentiated instruction across subject areas.

- Teachers will have the opportunity to discuss student data weekly during PLC planning sessions. They will work collaboratively to plan differentiated activities to meet the needs of all students during the instructional block.
- All ELA students will use Lexia PowerUp during their ELA instructional block.
- An added layer of intervention will be provided for our highest need math students (FAST PM Level 1 and Level 2) through intensive math classes in lieu of an elective (2-3 times/week) and

Eagle Advisory (daily).

These activities will be monitored by collecting and analyzing student formative/summative data and student diagnostic data (Savvas/PowerUP).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Rachel Bovino

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Student data will be used to plan for differentiated instruction and corresponding activities. These activities will identify and address academic gaps to support students toward grade-level standards mastery.

Rationale:

By combining online student-driven explicit instruction with teacher-delivered lessons and activities, ELA instruction is differentiated and tailored to the individual needs of struggling readers. This combination supports the development of fundamental literacy and higher-order thinking skills through adaptive learning paths. <https://www.evidenceforessa.org/program/lexia-powerup-literacy/>

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Savvas Math Diagnostic and Intervention Program

Rationale:

Diagnostic and intervention programs in mathematics provide critical support to help students succeed. By identifying learning gaps early, personalizing instruction, and supporting students throughout the process, educators can ensure that all students have the opportunity to feel success in math. <https://www.savvas.com/company/learn-about-savvas/newsroom/press-releases/2023/essa-studies-show-envision-math-series-helps-students-attain-significantly-higher-achievement>

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

If BTMS is strategic in scheduling students based on data, those 8th grade students placed with their ELA or Math teacher during Eagle Advisory in addition to those placed in Intensive Math during their electives will demonstrate an increase in Math student achievement of 19 points and/or ELA achievement of 7 points from 2024 to 2025 as measured by FAST PM 3 data.

Person Monitoring:

Rachel Bovino (Math) / Jaime Everage (ELA)

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Data will be monitored with quarterly progress assessments using the Savvas Math Diagnosis and Intervention System and Lexia PowerUp. This will enable the team to determine whether the intervention plan is effective and make any necessary adjustments real time, should data indicate the need.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

SWD data indicates the following:

ELA - 19% Achievement Level 3 or higher

Math - 26% Achievement Level 3 or higher

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

If BTMS is strategic in providing a framework for the 90-minute instructional block with a focus on differentiated, small group instruction, we will see an increase in achievement among our SWDs from 37% to 47%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Teachers will be furnished with a comprehensive framework delineating the overarching objectives, instructional materials, and staff responsibilities for the ninety-minute instructional block.

Administrative oversight of implementation fidelity will occur through instructional walkthroughs.

Teachers will receive ongoing feedback to support continuous improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Marquez Jackson (jacksonm02@flaglerschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for the Area of Focus is explicit, small group instruction. Teachers will set aside time in their instructional block to provide explicit, data-driven instruction in a small group setting.

Rationale:

Small group instruction and cooperative learning have a significant impact on student achievement (Hattie, 2009). This method of teaching allows teachers to individualize learning, pre teach, reteach or enhance student learning as well as provide feedback in a smaller student to teacher ratio.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Provide teachers with training on the 90-minute framework

Person Monitoring:

Jaime Everage

By When/Frequency:

August 2024

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will be provided Professional Learning regarding the 90-minute framework during pre-planning.

Action Step #2

Strategic scheduling of students based on data and student needs.

Person Monitoring:

Marquez Jackson

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers (Gen Ed & ESE) will participate in professional learning communities where they will analyze student data and determine appropriate groupings of students for implementation of small group instruction. Monitored through Administration walkthroughs and PLC forms.

Action Step #3

Continuous targeted monitoring of student data to measure growth and progress.

Person Monitoring:

Marquez Jackson

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing monthly monitoring of student data

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers (Gen Ed & ESE) will analyze student data through common formative and summative assessments, progress monitoring, state testing, Lexia Powerup, Savvas Diagnostics and IXL.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

23-24 Student Data shows the greatest areas of concern as:

7th Grade ELA: From 47% to 43%

8th Math: From 70% to 57%

If BTMS continues to prioritize weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) with a focus on standards-based instruction, data analysis and evidence-based strategies, we will see an increase in ELA and Math student achievement of 5 and 8 points respectively from 2024 to 2025 as measured by FAST PM 3 data.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

BTMS students will:

- Increase combined Math proficiency (not including Algebra/Geometry) by 8 points to 55%.
- Increase combined ELA proficiency by 5 points to 53%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Administration will walk through all core classrooms, once weekly. Data will be collected to indicate which instructional look fors were observed during each visit.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Rachel Bovino

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the

measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Teachers will meet weekly through professional learning communities (PLCs). They will prioritize essential benchmarks, determine learning targets, share instructional strategies and analyze common formative data throughout the unit to ensure students are learning according to essential learning outcomes. For those who are not, a plan is developed collectively to remediate those students toward mastery.

Rationale:

Flagler Schools has partnered with Solution Tree to provide high quality and deliberate learning opportunities for teachers through professional learning communities (PLCs). These PLCs are founded on a “focus on student learning”, “building a collaborative culture”, and a “focus on results.” These are achieved with a shared mission and vision as well as shared values and goals, collaborative teams, collective inquiry, a commitment to continuous improvement, and an action and results-oriented mindset. PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared data analysis and standards-aligned planning with a focus on student achievement. PLCs that make data a part of an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement, establish a clear vision for schoolwide data use, and provide support that fosters a data-driven culture have been shown to promote positive change in student outcomes measures. Sources: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/12> <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/blogs/RELMW-ESSA-Tiers-Video-Handout-508.pdf>

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

If BTMS is explicit in the expectation for collaborative weekly planning (PLC) to strategically analyze student data and plan for the 90-minute instructional block, students will demonstrate an increase in achievement in ELA by 5 points and Math by 8.

Person Monitoring:

Rachel Bovino

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The admin team will visit classrooms weekly during different, pre-planned sections of the 90-minute block to collect data using the "Instructional Look for" data collection tool. This data will indicate whether spiral review, explicit instruction, differentiated tasks and formative assessment are happening in compliance with the school provided framework. Additionally, the data will indicate if what's being covered in class aligns with what each grade level content area team planned for during their weekly PLC planning sessions to ensure that instruction is standards-aligned, differentiated and assessed to maximize learning for all students. The data will be analyzed monthly.

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

During the 2023-2024 school year 675 BTMS students received 3578 discipline referrals. Each referral requires the student to be removed from the classroom resulting in the loss of instructional time.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

BTMS will reduce office discipline referrals by 3% resulting in a decrease in the loss of instructional time

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The student service team will meet monthly to review school data, identify areas of concern and provide supports and interventions for students in need. It will be shared in monthly faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Mindi Scala

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

If BTMS utilizes the Capturing Kids' Hearts EXCEL Model in addition to continuing implementation of our House System, PBIS and the implementation of grade level teams, we will see an increase in student engagement as measured by student attendance, discipline, and academic achievement. How Being Part of a 'House' within a School Helps Students Gain a Sense of Belonging By Gail Cornwall <https://www.kqed.org/mindshift/50960/how-being-part-of-a-house-within-a-school-helps-students-gain-asense-of-belonging>

Rationale:

Lake Canyon Elementary school in Galt, California saw a 100% decrease in out of school

suspensions from 2016 to 2017 after implementing the house system.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Student Services Data Review

Person Monitoring:

Mindi Scala

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Student Services team will meet Bi-weekly to review student attendance, discipline, counseling services, and academic data to determine what interventions and supports are needed.

Action Step #2

Student-led Data Tracking - Academic and Behavioral

Person Monitoring:

Jaime Everage

By When/Frequency:

May 2025/Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Student-led Data Tracking - Students will track data weekly in Eagle Advisory. This data will include: attendance, academics and discipline incidences. Students will set goals and revisit them weekly in an ongoing attempt to continually improve both socially and academically.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

During SAC meetings, we review and discuss with stakeholders the Title I plan, budget, and activities. SAC committee members have input into the Schoolwide Program(SWP), implementation, review, and monitoring. Parents have input into the PFEP via SAC, PFEP event feedback and the Title I parent survey. The plan is posted on the District and school website (btmseagles.com). The plan is also sent to parents electronically through our school newsletter.

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

Parents have input into the PFEP via SAC, PFEP event feedback and the Title I parent survey. Each PFEP event has a survey that parents complete at the end to provide feedback on the event. Families also have an opportunity to request personal support on individual student related issues or needs. The PFEP can be viewed at <https://flaglerschoolscom.finalsite.com/students-families/parent-resources/family-engagement>

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii))

BTMS strategically plans Eagle Advisory classes to ensure that students are grouped to maximize opportunities for remediation and enrichment through the use of Lexia PowerUp, Savvas and IXL as well as small group instruction. MTSS Academic Interventionist will utilize evidence-based resources to address learning gaps. Level I- ELA/Reading students are placed in Intensive Reading where the evidence-based Rewards (reading) program is implemented. Our academic paraprofessional provides students additional academic support in Science and Social Studies classrooms to ensure learning for all students through small group, differentiated instruction. Additionally, BTMS will offer after school tutoring twice weekly (transportation provided) to support students in closing academic gaps with a goal for improved achievement in ELA and Math.

How Plan is Developed

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

N/A

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

In an effort to ensure that BTMS is meeting the needs of all students outside of the academic subject areas, our School Counselors and MTSS Behavior Interventionists are strategic in pulling small groups with a focus on the Resilience Model.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

In order to provide our students with opportunities for postsecondary awareness, BTMS will host a Career Fair for our 8th grade students in collaboration with the Junior Chamber of Commerce. This event will have several preceding activities intended to gauge student interest and promote goal setting. All students will self-reflect and assess their power skills using the "Work Habit Rubric" weekly during Eagle Advisory. Teachers will review, discuss and assist with goal-setting.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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 ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

BTMS utilizes PBIS as a Tier 1 support for all students. In addition, our Behavior Interventionist supports identified students individually as part of Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention. BTMS teachers are trained and will use the CKH Excel model as an additional resource and intervention for addressing problem behaviors.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii)(V)).

- Weekly Professional Learning Community sessions which uses data analysis while planning

for standards-aligned instruction, remediation and enrichment.

- Quarterly planning sessions for standards-aligned instruction with District curriculum specialists
- Professional Learning focused on literacy strategies across all subject areas
- Onboarding professional learning for new teachers
- Paraprofessional training

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

At the district level, funding and resource allocations are determined through several processes such as staffing plans & position control, comprehensive needs assessments, instructional resource review, and Title I funding.

At the school level, funding and resource allocations are determined by needs identified by the analysis of student academic and behavioral data.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

Students with Disabilities:

Our Federal Index was 37%. We must increase this by 5% to be at the minimum required 42%. Our 90-minute instructional block will allow for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students. Strategic planning will take place weekly with general education and support facilitation teachers. Data will be analyzed weekly during professional learning communities (PLC). Standards-based remediation will be provided. Quarterly standards-based alignment planning sessions with District curriculum specialists will take place. Administration will visit classrooms weekly and conduct data to ensure that all teachers are implementing the 90-minute framework with fidelity.

7th Grade Math:

31% of our 7th Grade Math students earned an achievement level of three or higher on the state assessment, which is 16 percentage points below the state.

Foundational Skills in Math (Intervention)

Savvas Realize Diagnostic and Intervention lessons will be used as the primary resource for instruction. Savvas Learning Company, enVision K-12 math series has met the ESSA Level 2 Evidence Standard by demonstrating a positive effect on student performance, according to three recent studies.

Eagle Advisory (Daily Remediation & Intervention)

Eagle Advisory provides an additional 50 minutes of math instruction daily that focuses on individual student needs using the Savvas intervention diagnostic assessments and corresponding lessons.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Areas of Focus	ESSA Subgroups - Students With Disabilities (SWD)	5200/0150	UNISIG	2.0	78, 566.31
	<i>Funding Source- Title I Academic Paraprofessionals to support Civics and 8th grade Science who are identified as SWD or in the MTSS process</i>				
Areas of Focus	Instructional Practice - Intervention	5100/0120	UNISIG	0.0	30, 562.56
	<i>Notes: \$30,562.56 tutoring stipends for 9 teachers - for tutoring in content areas (English, math, science, social studies). Students will be targeted based upon state progress monitoring data, Lexia and grades. Remediation The total for this activity with salary and benefits is \$30,562.56</i>				
Areas of Focus	Instructional Practice - Intervention	5100/0120	UNISIG	1.0	95, 500.08
	<i>Notes: BEHAVIOR INTERVENTIONIST (1) for grades 6-8 to support students receiving MTSS Tier 3 behavior interventions. This interventions will provide both academic support and behavior monitoring to our Tier 3 students during instructional and transition time. The total for this activity with salary and benefits is \$95,500.08</i>				
Areas of Focus	Instructional Practice - Intervention	5100/0120	UNISIG	3.0	235, 792.04
	<i>Notes: ACADEMIC INTERVENTIONIST (3) for grade 6, grade 7, and grade 8 to support students who have been identified through the MTSS process. These interventionists provide Tier 3 interventions in ELA and Math during small group instruction for identified students. The impact will be on approximately 300-400 students. The total for this activity with salary and benefits is \$235,792.04</i>				
Areas of Focus	Instructional Practice - Intervention	5100/0120	UNISIG	0.0	3, 395.84
	<i>Notes: Title 1 Coordinator Stipend We will utilize our PFE data and attendance to gauge parent participation in school community.</i>				
Areas of Focus	Instructional Practice - Professional Learning Communities	5100/0120	UNISIG	0.0	8, 181.40
	<i>Summer Professional Learning and Data Analysis. 19 teachers/2 days @ \$200 a day.</i>				
Total	Areas of Focus				451, 998.23
Plan Budget Total					451, 998.23