Okeechobee County School District

Central Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Central Elementary School

610 SW 5TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://centralelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Kubit

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/8/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Central Elementary School

610 SW 5TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://centralelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

To prepare all students to be college and career ready and function as productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Putting Students First

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kubit, Cynthia	Principal	
Norman, Christina	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Morgan	School Counselor	
Whiteside, RaeAnn	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	15	95	88	81	101	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	8	8	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	18	23	38	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	3	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	8	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
38

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	6	4	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	7	4	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	2	2	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	6	4	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	7	4	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	2	2	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	46%	52%	57%	40%	47%	55%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	52%	54%	58%	44%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	55%	53%	50%	57%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	62%	63%	60%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	42%	57%	62%	55%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	42%	51%	53%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	44%	53%	41%	42%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	15 (0)	95 (0)	88 (0)	81 (0)	101 (0)	91 (0)	471 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (8)	7 (9)	8 (6)	8 (4)	8 (6)	9 (16)	40 (49)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	4 (0)	2 (0)	10 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (18)	8 (7)	18 (4)	23 (2)	38 (1)	11 (9)	98 (41)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (24)	5 (32)	12 (40)	17 (96)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	57%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	46%	-4%	58%	-16%
	2018	35%	41%	-6%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	42%	50%	-8%	56%	-14%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	66%	0%	62%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	60%	-4%	64%	-8%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	45%	56%	-11%	60%	-15%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	44%	-8%	53%	-17%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
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	15	47	54	43	34	40	9				
ELL	34	45	64	53	50	50	28				
BLK	43	76		34	43		18				
HSP	40	49	64	63	48	47	37				
MUL	58			33							
WHT	54	44		63	35	17	50				
FRL	42	51	59	60	41	39	37				

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	27	40	56	30	32	25	26				
ELL	27	49	50	45	40	33	46				
BLK	29	31		43	47						
HSP	42	52	59	60	54	30	53				
WHT	52	51	58	64	56	23	60				
FRL	40	48	53	58	52	34	53				

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	16	34	47	33	37	42	24				
ELL	33	33	33	58	40	43	14				
BLK	22	43		32	75	92	29				
HSP	40	41	52	63	50	48	42				
WHT	48	49	50	67	56	29	45				
FRL	35	41	48	57	54	53	37				

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	47
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Mathematics performance for students in the lowest quartile, as well as Science overall proficiency showed the lowest performance (at 37 and 36 percent respectively). Yes, this is a year to year trend as mathematics in the lowest quartile lost 20 percentage points in 2018(53% to 33%) and was increased by only four percent this year. In science there was a loss of 18 percentage points from the prior year and this does not appear to be a year to year trend. Contributing factors may include inadequate or weak curriculum and resources as well as ELL students and bottom quartile students who lack vocabulary and problem-solving skills. Student engagement and rigorous instruction needs to be more consistent. Lack of focus on science instruction may also play a part in the loss of prior growth percentages.

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

Science achievement dropped drastically in comparison to the former year. Science overall proficiency went from 55 percentage points to 36 percent for a loss of 19 percent. In ELA, our students with disabilities sub-group also show a great decline. Teacher and leadership interviews indicate a lack of focus on Science Achievement compared to the year before. Departmentalizing grade levels may also be a contributing factor as well as lack of uniform curriculum implementation and consistent grade-level standard instruction. ELL and bottom quartile students also tend to struggle with on grade level vocabulary and text.

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.

Math Learning Gains as compared to the state average showed the greatest gap of 20 points. With only 42% of students showing learning gains in mathematics, as compared to the previous year's 54%, we have a very large percentage of students who showed no improvement at all.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement , with a 7 point gain from the State and from the year prior score. This is a trend as Central has scored higher than the state for 2 years in a row. These gains occurred after Walk to Intervention was implemented using Fountas & Pinnell leveled readers. Students are assessed and then participate in a daily 50 minute intervention group using these leveled readers.

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

The number of students receiving course failures in ELA and Mathematics continues to be high in grades 3 and 4. Attendance also continues to be an area in need of improvement with a total of 49 students below a 90 percent attendance rate.

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

1. ELA Achievements & Gains
2. Mathematics Achievement & Gains

3. Science Achievement
4. Attendance Focus (Student & Parent Education)
5. Building a Culture and Love of Reading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Learning Gains in Mathematics for Students in the Bottom Quartile
Rationale	According to state assessment data there is a downward trend in learning gains among the lowest twenty-five percent in mathematics. There is a significant decrease of bottom quartile students who made learning gains from 2017 to 2019 and a significant gap between bottom quartile student learning gains and the state average for bottom quartile learning gains on the state math assessment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math learning gains among our bottom quartile students will increase from 37% of students making a learning gain to 55% of students making a learning gain in the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers and Administration will utilize Data Chats to identify current levels of achievement using previous FSA Assessment and progress monitoring; such as iReady Diagnostic Assessment Data, benchmark data, Acaletics and Ready Math Assessment Data to form targeted intervention groups focused on closing the achievement gap in grades 3-5. PLCs will provide training for effective instruction strategies. Teachers will collaboratively plan for differentiated instruction that meets the rigor of the standard.Frequent walk-throughs and observations will confirm the use of best practices in instructional methods as well as increased tier 2 instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order to improve math gains among our bottom quartile students, Data Chats must occur frequently to progress monitor our targeted intervention groups. PLCs should result in increased strategic instruction, increased differentiation and rigorous standards-based instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers and Administration will participate in targeted professional development, collaborative planning and PLCs to facilitate strategic use of core and supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction and student practice.Core and supplemental instruction includes: Ready Mathematics and Acaletics. 2. Administration and the reading coach will conduct ongoing informal and formal classroom observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and Achieve the Core Instructional Practice Guide. 3. The leadership team will conduct quarterly formal data chats and bi-weekly informal data chats with teachers. 4. Students will maintain a data binder in grades 3-5 will participate in student-led conferences with their parents three times a year. 5. Teachers will maintain a class data binder to be utilized during data chats, and during lesson planning for Tier 2 strategic planning for students in need of differentiation.
Person Responsible	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase Science Achievement in Grade 5 by the end of the 2019-2020 School Year
Rationale	Student achievement in Grade 5 science is 37% compared to the state average of 53%. This was our greatest decline in points when comparing to the state averages.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student achievement in Grade 5 science will increase from 37% to 55% in the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers and Administration will utilize Data Chats to identify current levels of achievement using previous state assessment data and progress monitoring; such as Performance Matters Assessment Data, Pearson Elevate Assessments and Study Island Assessment Data to form targeted intervention groups focused on closing the achievement gap in grade 5. PLCs will provide training for effective instructional strategies. Teachers will collaboratively plan for differentiated instruction that meets the rigor of the standard.Frequent walk-throughs and observations will confirm the use of best practices in instructional methods as well as increased tier 2 instruction. Use of learning goals and student-led data chats allowing students to take ownership of their learning. Science literacy will be facilitated school-wide through a K-5 science fair project, Science Olympiad Team competitions, installation and usage of a STEM Lab and teaching CPalms Modeling Elicit Activities (MEA) lessons/hands-on inquiry based science lessons during Media time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order to improve science gains for our students, Data Chats must occur frequently to progress monitor our targeted intervention groups. PLCs should result in increased strategic instruction, increased differentiation and rigorous standards-based instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. Calendars, agendas, attendance, minutes and training materials will document professional development, collaborative planning and PLCs. 2. Data Chats utilizing teacher classroom data sheets and student data sheets. 3. Informal and formal classroom observation data. 4. Study Island Benchmark tests, Performance Matters Science Interim Data, State Assessment Data and Pearson Elevate Assessment Data results. 5. STEM lab usage, Parent Science Nights, and Science Olympiad Competitions.
Person Responsible	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase Student Performance in ELA, Mathematics, and Science with Students with Disabilities
Rationale	According to state assessment and ESSA subgroup data for Students with Disabilities there is an upward trend in math achievement, math learning gains and math learning gains for the lowest 25%, however, math learning gains are still below the Federal Threshold at 41% with an even larger gap between District and State percentages. ELA achievement went down, while ELA learning gains increased by 7%. In addition, ELA learning gains in the bottom 25 % of students with disabilities went down by 2 percentage points. Science declined by 17 points in students with disabilities.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math, ELA and Science will show an increase in student performance with our students with disabilities in the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers and Administration will utilize Data Chats to identify current levels of achievement using previous FSA Assessment and progress monitoring; such as iReady Diagnostic Assessment Data, benchmark data, Acaletics, Ready Math Assessment Data, and Performance Matters Science Assessments to form targeted intervention groups focused on closing the achievement gap in grades 3-5 for students with disabilities. PLCs will provide training for effective instruction strategies. Teachers will collaboratively plan for differentiated instruction with inclusion teachers that meets the rigor of the standard. Frequent walk-throughs and observations will confirm the use of best practices in instructional methods as well as increased tier 2 instructional groups of both General Education and ESE Teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order to improve Math, ELA and Science gains among our SWD students, Data Chats must occur frequently to progress monitor our targeted intervention groups. PLCs should result in increased strategic instruction, increased differentiation and rigorous standards-based instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers and Administration will participate in targeted professional development, collaborative planning and PLCs to facilitate strategic use of core and supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction and student practice. Core and supplemental instruction includes: Ready Mathematics and Acaletics, iReady, ReadyGen, Elevate and Study Island. 2. Administration and the reading coach will conduct ongoing informal and formal classroom observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and Achieve the Core Instructional Practice Guide. 3. The leadership team will conduct quarterly formal data chats and bi-weekly informal data chats with teachers to provide feedback and guide PLC direction. 4. Students will maintain a data binder in grades 3-5 will participate in student-led conferences with their parents three times a year. 5. Teachers will maintain a class data binder to be utilized during data chats, and during lesson planning for Tier 2 strategic planning for students in need of differentiation.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

1. ELA Improvements are ongoing as we continue to implement Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Walk to Intervention Groups for 50 minutes a day. These groups are fluid and set by the teacher based on ongoing diagnostic assessment data. We are also implementing phonics curriculum in grades K-2 using Blast and Countdown materials.
2. Attendance Initiative targets those students with less than 90% attendance. Mentors are assigned and phone calls are made. Skylert calls go home to notify and express the important role attendance has on academics. Rewards for improving attendance results in things such as an ice-cream party, etc.
3. Building a culture of Reading is also important. Renewed efforts for rewarding AR readers has been implemented. Students are placed on a leader-board, social media recognition, certificates, point clubs and healthy competitions are in place. Family Read Nights allow for parents to receive short professional development opportunities to discover the importance of reading at school and at home. DEAR time has been implemented where all classes at a grade level designated time literally "drop everything and read"!

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

Okeechobee County Schools welcomes every opportunity to enhance relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school mission and support the needs of students. Open House is an annual activity where students and families are invited on campus tomeet their child’s teachers, administration and many of the support staff that are in direct contact with students. In addition to Open House, parent nights are held throughout the year and generally focus around a student activity or content area, such as ELA or Math.
Secondary sites even host a CTE Spotlight where community members, students and parents can attend and learn more about the CTE courses and programs that are available at the secondary level.

Elementary sites, participate in APTT, Academic Parent Teacher Teams. APTT meetings occur four times per year where student data is shared on foundational reading and math skills. Parents are able to see exactly where their child is performing compared to other students in the class. Teachers then teach an activity and provide materials for parents utilize at home with their child. These activities will enhance instruction and enrich skills needed to be successful in reading and math.

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.

Our school district has an extensive program designed to identify barriers to learning and promote social and emotional health all while implementing programs that address mental health so that our students are academically successful. Our school guidance counselor is trained to identify students who may need student support services. Our guidance counselor, with open communication with families, can often provide the support needed. In some cases Threat Assessments are conducted to determine if students are a danger to themselves or others. This Threat Assessment is done by a team that includes law enforcement and a trained crisis counselor. If a threat exists, counseling is recommended to the parents and parenting classes can be offered as well.

In addition to the services provided by our school personnel, students who are identified as needing services have access to services provided through our Community Collaborative Council. This community council partnerships with organizations that can provide food for families, money to pay for electric bills, money to pay for doctor visits, school supplies, parenting classes, mental health counseling, and clothes.

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

Through vertical teaming meetings, teachers at Central meet and discuss the various characteristics of cohorts both entering and leaving the school. This discussion enables teachers to better-support the students in each cohort.

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.

The leadership team meets on a weekly basis for formal meetings to review the needs of the school. During these meetings, all possible resources are discussed, whether they are financial, personnel, or curricular in nature. The budgeting process is conducted carefully each year, following a review of school data. This results in the creation of a budget that coordinates internal, county, and federal funds in such a way as to maximize their impact. The data review at this meeting follows the Step Zero model, so as to ensure that the impact of the resources is maximized. All meetings are led by the principal, but all members of the leadership team, as well as grade level leadership, are involved.

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

The school works to establish a school-wide Career and/or College Ready mindset. Schools host career days, reality fairs and have guest speakers from the community to educate students about career opportunities in our local community. Okeechobee’s CTE program works with business and industry partners to ensure our students complete CTE courses having the skill set that makes our students employable. Okeechobee has a superb relationship with Indian River State College and high school students may take dual enrollment courses for high school and college credit. Many students graduate with an AA degree at the same time they graduate from high school.