South Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

South Elementary School

2468 SW 7TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://southelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	A	C	D*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 1/7/2019.

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.

South Elementary School's mission is to help our students establish a solid academic foundation on which the building blocks of learning can be erected. We instill in our students a sense of respect for personal property and a sense of respect for community responsibility. Our students will leave South Elementary School equipped with the skills they need to successfully transition to higher education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eagles SOAR
Seek Opportunities and Achieve Results

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Streelman, Emily	Principal
Hawk, Heather	Instructional Coach
King, Brian	School Counselor
	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Emily Streelman is the Principal at South Elementary School. It is the principal's role to be an instructional coach and leader at the school. It is the responsibility of the principal to ensure the school is working towards achieving its goals. A leadership team is formed to share ideas and suggestions for school improvement. Maura Cox, the Assistant Principal, supports our school improvement plan through monitoring instruction and providing instructional feedback to teachers as necessary. Heather Hawk, the instructional coach, has the responsibility of monitoring the data at our school to ensure students are mastering the standards appropriately. The instructional coach will also model instructional lessons, data analysis, and data chats with struggling teachers. Brian King, the guidance counselor, will work to monitor data and intervention plans of MTSS students to ensure those students on Tiers 2 and 3 achieve academic and behavioral successes.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	4	2	2	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	3	2	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	148	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	2	19	61	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	3	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected
Friday 9/14/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	3	2	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	9	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	132	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	26	7	10	20	56	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

Year 2016-17 - 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	3	2	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	9	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	132	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	26	7	10	20	56	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA Achievement performed the lowest demonstrating 50% proficiency. There has been a slow decline the last few years in ELA Achievement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The learning gains among the lowest 25% of students in ELA declined 16 points. Historically, the school has not shown major improvements among bottom quartile students.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA achievement was six percent lower than the state average, which was the biggest gap component. As a positive, the bottom quartile students' math gains were 14 percent higher than the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Both the learning gains of all students and learning gains of our lowest 25% of students showed the most improvement in math. This improved 14% in each category and is a trend at the school.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The school is continuing to use Acaletics in their daily math instruction. Additionally, 4th and 5th grades continued to be departmentalized allowing more time to prepare lessons and master content. The MAFS books from Curriculum Associates and Measuring Up were still utilized. Teachers continued to collaborate and supplement math materials as needed. A change that led to this improvement was the departmentalization of third grade. Teachers were able to focus on their standards in math and collaborate with a peer teacher.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	47%	56%	47%	42%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	47%	55%	53%	47%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	46%	48%	40%	50%	46%
Math Achievement	64%	59%	62%	60%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	73%	54%	59%	64%	51%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	41%	47%	41%	40%	46%
Science Achievement	65%	54%	55%	59%	41%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (3)	2 (2)	2 (0)	0 (4)	4 (2)	3 (3)	15 (14)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (2)	2 (9)	9 (6)	6 (1)	20 (18)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (20)	148 (132)	23 (150)	194 (302)

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	2018	54%	53%	1%	57%	-3%
	2017	48%	50%	-2%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	48%	41%	7%	56%	-8%
	2017	63%	44%	19%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%
	2017	58%	41%	17%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
	2017	57%	67%	-10%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
	2017	74%	56%	18%	64%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2018	78%	56%	22%	61%	17%
	2017	73%	53%	20%	57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	22	33	48	44	44	29	37				
ELL	33	48		44	70						
BLK	30	32		61	84		45				
HSP	48	56	63	59	70	50	57				
WHT	52	49	52	66	72	61	70				
FRL	48	50	52	64	73	63	61				

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	31	51	56	38	57	64	50				
ELL	34	75		61	67						
BLK	29	60		52	47						
HSP	51	78	71	69	67	60	87				
WHT	66	62	65	70	63	75	63				
FRL	51	67	69	62	66	71	59				

Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Reading and writing instruction is rigorous and standards based.
Rationale	ELA achievement was at 50% proficiency on the 2018 FSA. There has been a slow decline in ELA achievement during the last few years. The lowest component of 2018 FSA testing was the learning gains of the lowest 25% of the students. Proficiency and learning gains for bottom quartile students are a focus of the school.
Intended Outcome	ELA achievement will be 58% on the 2019 FSA. 62% of the lowest 25% of students will make adequate learning gains.
Point Person	[no one identified]

Action Step	
Description	All teachers will identify their ELA bottom quartile students and plan to implement differentiated instruction to all students. This would include fluid grouping of students by academic needs. The leadership team will adopt the bottom quartile students to mentor those students through data chats, incentives, and positive interactions. Grade level teams will meet regularly to progress monitor students and brainstorm interventions necessary. Teams will ensure interventions are working and being used with fidelity. These meetings will be differentiated in order to meet the needs of all students and teachers. Teachers will have students write weekly with a purpose.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Administration will be visible in classrooms, provide instructional feedback and conference with teachers as necessary to ensure fidelity in implementation. Standards mastery and iReady data will be analyzed bi-monthly by the leadership team and discussed at monthly meetings. The reading coach will initiate the coaching cycle for teachers to peer observe to improve instructional practice. Students will be strategically scheduled in order to maximize the time ESE inclusion students are served. Top Score Writing will be used in all ELA classrooms in order to prepare students for the writing component of FSA. Instructional needs of teachers will be prioritized by the reading coach, assistant principal and principal.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Activity #2	
Title	Math and science instruction is rigorous and standards based.
Rationale	Math achievement was at 64% proficiency on the 2018 FSA. The lowest component of 2018 FSA math testing was the learning gains of the lowest 25% of the students. Proficiency and learning gains for bottom quartile students are a focus of the school.
Intended Outcome	Math achievement will be 68% on the 2019 FSA. 69% of the lowest 25% of students will make adequate learning gains.
Point Person	[no one identified]

Action Step	
Description	All teachers will identify their math bottom quartile students and plan to implement differentiated instruction to all students. This would include fluid grouping of students by academic needs. The leadership team will adopt the bottom quartile students to mentor those students through data chats, incentives, and positive interactions. Grade level teams will meet regularly to progress monitor students and brainstorm interventions necessary. Teams will ensure interventions are working and being used with fidelity. These meetings will be differentiated in order to meet the needs of all students and teachers. Teachers will have students write and verbalize their reasoning when solving problems. Students will participate in vetted, standards-based investigations in the science classes. 3rd-5th grade teachers will plan science lessons that mirror the content focus report and item specifications.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Administration will be visible in classrooms, provide instructional feedback and conference with teachers as necessary to ensure fidelity in implementation. Standards mastery and iReady data will be analyzed bi-monthly by the leadership team and discussed at monthly meetings for math. The reading coach will initiate the coaching cycle for teachers to peer observe to improve instructional practice. Students will be strategically scheduled in order to maximize the time ESE inclusion students are served. Instructional needs of teachers will be prioritized by the reading coach, assistant principal and principal. Science will be progressed monitored with interim assessments and benchmark assessments. Study Island will be used in 5th grade classrooms and to support K-4 standards.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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 Pilot SIP 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.

The plan is designed to give parents the tools and resources necessary for them to help their children at home to improve student achievement. Parent involvement is the participation of parents in two-way and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities.

https://app1.fldoe.org/bsa/ParentInvolvementPlan/PrintPlan.aspx

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.

The social-emotional needs of our students are met through our ESE services, private counseling agencies, guidance personnel, teachers, and administrators. Each student's needs are different, and the appropriate intervention is made by those listed above. Our MTSS is the primary process used to determine the specific need and the level of support needed.

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

South Elementary School faculty use vertical teaming to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another. Teachers meet to discuss the needs and remarkable attributes of each cohort as the transition occurs.

In addition, the principal at SES communicates with the principal at the feeder middle school to discuss trend data that is used to hone in on particular standards to teach after the 5th grades take the FSA assessment. This collaboration helps students in that we are preparing them at the end of their 5th grade year so that they are better prepared to enter 6th grade.

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.

Tracy Downing - Principal - School Leadership Team meetings, Data Chats, PD, Coaching Cycle, Literacy First
Bryan Van Camp - Asst. Principal - MTSS (behavioral) meetings, Coaching Cycle, Literacy First
Heather Hawk - Reading Coach - PLC meetings, Coaching Cycle, Literacy First
Brian King- Guidance Counselor - IEP and MTSS (academic) meetings
Lara Stanley-Teacher-PLC meetings, Coaching Cycle, Literacy First
Josh Van Wormer-Teacher-PLC meetings, Coaching Cycle, Literacy First
Derek Stewart-Teacher-PLC meetings, Coaching Cycle, Literacy First

All members serve on the school leadership team. There are weekly leadership team meetings. School decisions are collectively made at these meetings regarding the coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. The School Leadership Team discusses fund raising efforts, allocation of resources, budget concerns, and general school operations. The School Leadership Team coordinates all school committees and collectively discusses all NEXT-STEPS for the advancement of student achievement.

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

Our DIAP and our SIP focuses on ensuring grade level benchmarks are met each year so that our students graduate from high school and go on to college or enter the work force with the skills they need to be successful.

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$0.00**