

Okeechobee County School District

Everglades Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Everglades Elementary School

3725 SE 8TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

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

Demographics

Principal: Christina Norman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (53%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 10/13/2020.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Everglades Elementary School

3725 SE 8TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">53%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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 ensure that all students are college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everglades Elementary School believes all children have the ability to reach their full potential through collaborative efforts of the faculty, staff, parents, community and students. Everglades will cultivate an appreciation and respect for lifelong learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ellis, Jennifer	Principal	
Stinnett, Melanie	School Counselor	
White, Ann	Teacher, ESE	
Trent, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Murrish, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Stanley, Lara	Instructional Coach	
Laskey, Robin	Instructional Media	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/25/2019, Christina Norman

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

4

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (53%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 .	

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	69	78	110	90	98	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	31	11	16	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	7	9	9	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	4	5	9	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	139	102	111	93	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630
Attendance below 90 percent	6	31	11	16	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	14	29	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	11	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	66	139	102	111	93	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630
Attendance below 90 percent	6	31	11	16	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	14	29	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	11	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	52%	57%	42%	47%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	58%	45%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	55%	53%	51%	57%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	62%	63%	56%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	57%	62%	49%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	42%	51%	46%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	44%	53%	35%	42%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	59%	-2%	58%	-1%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	46%	5%	58%	-7%
	2018	38%	41%	-3%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	51%	50%	1%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	66%	-4%	62%	0%
	2018	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	60%	-3%	64%	-7%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	51%	56%	-5%	60%	-9%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	44%	-5%	53%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	22	42	44	31	45	34	21				
ELL	44	57	50	51	60	21	30				
BLK	39	50		44	60						
HSP	49	61	45	53	63	23	27				
MUL	53	55		47	45						
WHT	58	68	61	64	63	45	54				
FRL	50	60	52	56	58	35	39				
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	20	39	42	35	51	36	32				
ELL	27	48	57	43	41	42	40				
BLK	38	40		31	50						
HSP	36	47	52	49	50	50	41				
MUL	40			47							
WHT	48	56	53	49	52	35	51				
FRL	41	50	49	48	52	45	44				
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	21	31	35	40	40	33	14				
ELL	31	47	61	51	57	80	13				
BLK	27	42		40	42						
HSP	36	38	52	54	49	52	26				
MUL	40			60							
WHT	46	50	47	58	50	37	44				
FRL	38	42	49	55	49	46	30				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Only 35% of the bottom quartile students showed learning gains on Math FSA in 2018-2019. The school wide focus for the 18-19 and 19-20 school years was ELA and Literacy First professional development.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior school year was math bottom quartile. The school wide focus for the 18-19 school year was ELA and Literacy First professional development.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the stated average was 4th grade math. Last school year three classrooms were self-contained. For the upcoming school year, we have departmentalized ELA and Math to allow those teachers to become experts in those subject areas.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade ELA. All teachers in grade K - 5 participated in Literacy First professional development during the 18-19 school year. All teachers also participated in regular PLCs where ELA lesson plans were developed following the anatomy of a lesson.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One concern for Everglades Elementary School regarding our Early Warning System data is that we have 29 students in 3rd grade and 21 students in 5th grade with course failure in ELA or Math. Also, we have 19 students in 5th grade with two or more early warning indicators.

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

1. Bottom Quartile Math
2. 4th Grade Math
3. 5th Grade Science
4. ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains
5. Math Proficiency and Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the 18 - 19 school year, 54% of students were proficient in ELA. In the 2018-2019 school year, Everglades Elementary had a goal of earning 60% proficiency in all subject areas. We fell short of our goals and will continue to implement evidence based strategies in 20 - 21 to meet these goals.

Measurable Outcome: In the 20 - 21 school year, Everglades Elementary School students will achieve 60% proficiency in ELA.
Everglades Elementary School students will have 70% of students make learning gains in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: All K-5 teachers will participate in Literacy First professional development sessions throughout the 20-21 school year. Topics will include: Gradual Release Model, Anatomy of a Lesson, Components of the Reading Block, PA and PH instruction, Vocabulary, Comprehension, Centers, and My Data First.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By providing teachers with instructional professional development and resources, classroom instruction will be effectively supported to ensure student learning and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During PLCs in the 20-21 school year, the administrative team will meet with grade levels (K – 5) to write ELA lesson plans.
2. The Bottom Quartile will be identified and provided with additional remedial instruction.
3. The administrative team will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs during ELA instruction to ensure successful implementation of the evidence based strategies and to identify any areas in need of improvement.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>To increase student achievement through rigorous, standards based instruction in ELA, Math, and Science for Students with Disabilities.</p> <p>At Everglades Elementary School, students with disabilities fell below 41% of the federal percent of points index for the 18-19 school year.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>For the 20-21 school year, students with disabilities will earn 45% or more of the points on the federal index.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)</p> <p>All ESE teachers will participate in Literacy First professional development sessions and PLC sessions during the 19-20 school year.</p> <p>All ESE teachers will be provided with support by the instructional coach who will model lessons and provide ESE teachers with appropriate instructional resources.</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>All ESE inclusion teachers will provide support for ESE students in the full time classrooms.</p> <p>All ESE students will be invited to participate in after school tutorial for remedial instruction in ELA, Math, and Science.</p> <p>By providing teachers with instructional professional development and resources, classroom instruction will be effectively supported to ensure student learning.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>By providing ESE students with tutorial services, student achievement will improve.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. During PLCs in the 20-21 school year, the administrative team will meet with ESE teachers to write ELA and math remedial lesson plans.
2. The Bottom Quartile, including ESE students, will be identified and provided with additional remedial instruction.
3. The administrative team will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs in ESE classrooms during ELA and math instruction to ensure successful implementation of the evidence based strategies and to identify any areas in need of improvement.

4. Ensure that all ESE students are invited to attend after school tutorial for remedial instruction.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the 18 - 19 school year, 58% of students were proficient in Math. In the 2018-2019 school year, Everglades Elementary had a goal of earning 60% proficiency in all subject areas. We fell short of our goals and will continue to implement evidence based strategies in 20 - 21 to meet these goals.

Measurable Outcome: In the 20 - 21 school year, Everglades Elementary School students will achieve 60% proficiency in Math.
Everglades Elementary School students will have 70% of students make learning gains in Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: All K-5 teachers will participate in professional development sessions throughout the 20-21 school year. Topics will include: Gradual Release Model, Anatomy of a Lesson, Components of the Math Block, and small group math instruction.
All K - 5 teachers will participate in Math PLC sessions throughout the 20-21 school year. Topics and activities will include: writing lesson plans that follow the Anatomy of a Lesson for each standard and identifying resources for practice, reteaching, and enrichment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By providing teachers with instructional professional development and resources, classroom instruction will be effectively supported to ensure student learning and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The leadership team will start meeting immediately to review the math curriculum maps and the Ready Math curriculum. The team will specifically look at grades 3 – 5 for standards assessed and alignment with test item specs. Additional resources will be identified to use for specific standards.
2. During PLCs in the 20-21 school year, the administrative team will meet with grade levels (K – 5) to write standards based math lesson plans. Grade levels will also begin to work with the BEST Standards to unpack standards and prepare for future instruction.
3. The Bottom Quartile will be identified and provided with additional remedial instruction.
4. The administrative team will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs during math instruction to ensure successful implementation of the evidence based strategies and to identify any areas in need of improvement

Person Responsible Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Although there has been improvement in FSA writing scores in 2018-2019, when compared with 2017-2018 data there is additional need for improvement. In 2018-2019 the 4th grade writing average score was a 5.5 and the 5th grade writing average score was a 6.5. EES has a goal that all students in 4th – 5th grade earn a 7 on the FSA writing test. When all students in 4th – 5th grade earn a 7 or higher on the FSA writing test, ELA proficiency and learning gains will improve.

Proposed solution for the 20 - 21 school year:

Data Review: Gather 4th and 5th grade writing teachers together to disaggregate FSA writing scores and discuss specific areas in need of improvement.

- **Review scoring sampler papers and informative/opinion rubrics**

Plan for 20 - 21 Writing Instruction: 4th and 5th grade writing teachers and admin team will discuss and identify which writing resources will be utilized for both informative and opinion writing.

- **The group will meet regularly throughout the school year to discuss progress and review writing data.**
- **Teachers will bring writing samples from their classes to PLCs to calibrate writing scores and discuss progress on each area of writing (planning, intro paragraphs, body paragraphs, conclusions, vocabulary, structure, etc.)**
- **The reading coach will support new writing teachers to 3rd - 5th grade.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Okeechobee County Schools welcome 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 to meet 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.

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 to utilize at home with their child. These activities will enhance instruction and enrich skills needed to be successful in reading and math.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00