

Okeechobee County School District

South Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

South Elementary School

2468 SW 7TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

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

Demographics

Principal: Lonnie Steiert

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-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) | 98% |
| 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: D (38%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

South Elementary School

2468 SW 7TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">45%</p> |

School Grades History

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

It is the mission of South Elementary School to prepare children for college and career by addressing the needs of the whole child. We create a safe and secure school environment that promotes social and academic growth and develops an enthusiasm for learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Elementary School is a place where all students are encouraged to strive for excellence academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Our goal is to work in a partnership with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their maximum potential. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Streelman, Emily | Principal | Ensure the use of curriculum, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, communicate expectations and details of the SIP, hire and evaluate staff. |
| Hawk, Heather | Instructional Coach | Assess reading achievement progress, provide professional development and coaching for teachers, plan and implement PLCs based on school-level instructional trend data. |
| | School Counselor | Track ELL student progress, counsel students, coordinate with instructional staff on student matters, coordinate school-wide state testing. |
| McCluskey, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | Conference with parents to discuss student behavioral concerns, respond to disciplinary issues, oversee school facilities, manage safety team, provide professional development on instructional strategies, PBIS, and classroom management; evaluate instructional staff. |
| Tedders, Dana | Instructional Media | Promote a love of literacy, empower students to be critical thinkers, enthusiastic readers, and skillful researchers. |

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 | 33 | 98 | 82 | 89 | 82 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 469 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 21 | 15 | 23 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |

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 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

44

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 | 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 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 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 61 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |

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 | 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 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 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 61 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |

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 | 49% | 52% | 57% | 58% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | 54% | 58% | 66% | 51% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 61% | 55% | 53% | 68% | 57% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 59% | 62% | 63% | 68% | 61% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 53% | 57% | 62% | 63% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | 42% | 51% | 69% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 37% | 44% | 53% | 66% | 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 | 33 (0) | 98 (0) | 82 (0) | 89 (0) | 82 (0) | 85 (0) | 469 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 (4) | 14 (2) | 12 (2) | 10 (0) | 13 (4) | 9 (3) | 73 (15) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 8 (1) | 4 (0) | 5 (0) | 12 (0) | 11 (1) | 40 (2) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 (0) | 21 (0) | 15 (3) | 23 (2) | 13 (9) | 17 (6) | 90 (20) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (23) | 4 (148) | 14 (23) | 18 (194) |

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 | 52% | 59% | -7% | 58% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 53% | 1% | 57% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 46% | -1% | 58% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 41% | 7% | 56% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 43% | 50% | -7% | 56% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 44% | 0% | 55% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 59% | 66% | -7% | 62% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 62% | -16% | 62% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 59% | 60% | -1% | 64% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 56% | 12% | 62% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 55% | 56% | -1% | 60% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 56% | 22% | 61% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -23% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -13% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 44% | -4% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 52% | 11% | 55% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -23% | | | | |
| 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 | 24 | 49 | 67 | 38 | 49 | 32 | 15 | | | | |

| 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 |
| ELL | 33 | 43 | 53 | 51 | 45 | 20 | 10 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 42 | | 39 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 49 | 56 | 54 | 44 | 15 | 25 | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 58 | 67 | 62 | 57 | 47 | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 49 | 64 | 53 | 52 | 39 | 22 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

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 | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 49 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 395 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| 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 | 38 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 39 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 42 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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.

The lowest 25% of students making learning gains in math dropped tremendously. We had a substitute teacher in one of the math classes, which affected the gains of those 45 students in 4th grade. In 5th grade, there was a lack of planning and collaboration on making fluid groups with the lower students/

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

Science scores made the greatest decline. There was not enough emphasis on inquiry-based learning. Reading skills were not also addressed while teaching the content.

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.

Both science and the lowest 25% in math had the greatest gap. I believe we taught to the middle and did not provide enough differentiated instruction, including reading instruction for science.

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

The lowest 25% of ELA students making learning gains showed the most improvement. We placed our instructional coach in the two 4th grade ELA classrooms from January-April. She coached the teachers on how to determine the lowest 25%, how to hold data chats with those students, and best practices for differentiated instruction to move those students towards academic growth in reading.

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

Attendance is concerning because we have such a high number of students with excessive absences. The number of suspensions was also concerning because suspension does not allow a child to learn from their mistakes.

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

1. Lowest 25% in math
2. sub groups: ELL, SWD, African American population
3. science proficiency
4. EWS students
5. ELA and math proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | Lowest 25% of students in math and ELA |
| Rationale | These students scored particularly low for making their learning gains in math last school year. This group must be targeted, but we also want to increase the percentage in ELA. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The learning gains of the lowest 25% of students will increase by 7% in math and by 3% in ELA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Through the use of targeted tutoring, mentor data chats, and student-led conferences, the lowest 25% of students will demonstrate learning gains in math and ELA. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | There is evidence that extra practice yields academic growth among students. Furthermore, students that have a mentor to check in and out with perform higher. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the bottom quartile in math and share lists with teachers. 2. Assign students a mentor for data check ins. 3. Ensure students track mastery data. 4. Participate in classroom and mentor-based student-led conferences. |
| Person Responsible | Heather Hawk (heather.hawk@okee.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | Subgroups: ELL, SWD, African American Students |
| Rationale | According to the ESSA report, our students with disabilities, ELL students, and African American are under-performing on state assessments. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | These three subgroups will increase their performance by 5% on the state assessment this school year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | The students in these sub-groups will track data, participate in data chats, and conduct student-led conferences with their parents and teachers. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Research indicates that students perform higher when aware of their goals and academic performance. The students will assume a leadership role in discussing their academic progress and goal setting and revision. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the students in these sub groups and communicate that to all teachers. 2. Conduct PLC on data tracking. 3. Implement student-led conferences. |
| Person Responsible | Jennifer McCluskey (jennifer.mccluskey@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).

We will address science proficiency by ensuring all instruction and assessments are aligned to the item specifications. To address early warning system students, we will meet monthly to review the EWS reports and assign mentors if needed to students that continue to show concern. ELA and math proficiency will be addressed by ensuring all students are tracking data and receiving rigorous, standards-based instruction.

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.

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. Our MTSS is the primary process used to determine the specific need and the level of support needed. This year, our students will be immersed in 15 minutes of daily social-emotional learning using a school-wide SEL curriculum.

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

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.

Emily Streelman - Principal - School Leadership Team meetings, Data Chats, PD, SEL
Jennifer McCluskey - Asst. Principal - MTSS (behavioral) meetings, Discipline PD, Data Chats
Heather Hawk - Reading Coach - PLC meetings, Data Chats
Judy Adler- Guidance Counselor - IEP and MTSS (academic) meetings
Janelle Johns-PreK Reading Coach-PLC meetings, Data Chats
Dana Tedders-Media Specialist-PLC meetings, Data Chats

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 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 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.