

Hendry County Schools

Central 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Central Elementary School

1000 S DEANE DUFF AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=10&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry County School Board.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Central Elementary School

1000 S DEANE DUFF AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=10&sc_id=1171294169

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-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	83%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry County School Board.

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.

The mission of Central Elementary School is to create a family culture that produces growth in student achievement and is highly regarded for its academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Central Elementary School is to continuously improve upon high academic excellence, while inspiring each student to reach their potential, in a safe learning environment.

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
Carter, Melissa	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Morrell, Barbara	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Pearson, Eileen	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Price, Alexis	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Barnes, Brooke	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Bradberry, Alicia	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Stone, Kylie	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC)

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Kane, Meredith	School Counselor	a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Atkinson, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Cirano-Lan, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers
Parrish, Tamara	Teacher, PreK	a. Lead Grade Group weekly meeting (Agenda & Notes) b. Collect Weekly iReady data for board and turn into Mrs. Carter by Friday afternoon. c. Delegate representation for meetings (PTO & SAC) d. Provide sub/discipline folder of work for their grade e. Mentoring new teachers

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Melissa Carter

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	95	91	85	90	86	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	7	11	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	
One or more suspensions	6	2	4	9	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	5	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in Math	2	0	4	13	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	1	0	5	14	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
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

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	103	89	98	102	111	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599	
Attendance below 90 percent	40	30	37	45	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220	
One or more suspensions	4	7	15	13	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	13	17	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	

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	2	1	6	19	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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

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	103	89	98	102	111	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	40	30	37	45	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	4	7	15	13	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	13	17	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	1	6	19	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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

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	58%	50%	57%	48%	44%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	54%	58%	60%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	50%	53%	63%	45%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	56%	63%	60%	48%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	62%	62%	77%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	51%	69%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	44%	53%	47%	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	51%	47%	4%	58%	-7%
	2018	41%	44%	-3%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	48%	7%	58%	-3%
	2018	57%	47%	10%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	62%	47%	15%	56%	6%
	2018	53%	45%	8%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	52%	11%	62%	1%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
	2018	59%	54%	5%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	63%	53%	10%	60%	3%
	2018	63%	54%	9%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	41%	22%	53%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	43%	8%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
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	53	84		59	74						
ELL	45	57	53	58	54	58	53				
BLK	46	43		49	58	50	44				
HSP	57	68	70	64	61	46	68				
WHT	80	75		89	89		80				
FRL	54	62	68	61	64	50	63				
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	57	71		55	68		82				
ELL	33	58	60	52	62	60					
BLK	40	57	63	57	73	64	48				
HSP	50	66	58	58	67	45	45				
WHT	64	68		72	82		67				
FRL	51	66	68	60	71	59	52				
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	32	82	90	68	88						
ELL	37	59	56	55	79	69	40				
BLK	32	46	64	45	66	60	24				
HSP	50	63	60	63	82	71	48				
WHT	66	67		68	74		83				
FRL	47	60	63	58	76	72	46				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	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	83
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	60
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.

Due to COVID-19 our data is from 2018-2019 - Our Learning Gains in our lowest 25% in Math was our lowest student performance component. However, our Math Achievement did increase from 60% (2017-2018) to 65% (2018-2019). I feel as if our lowest 25% students did not perform as well due to the change in the format of the assessment (ex: grids/open response questions). Our lowest 25% in 5th grade did show quite a bit of growth the year before.

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

Due to COVID-19 our data is from 2018-2019 - Our Math Learning Gains did decline from last year, but our proficiency increased 5%. Our Math Learning Gains declined from 70% (2017-2018) to 65% (2018-2019). Some of the factors of the decline in Math Learning Gains are that we tested Math immediately after ELA FSA this year and did not have a time frame for extra Math review only. Math small groups were not implemented as well as they could've been.

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.

Due to COVID-19 our data is from 2018-2019 - None of our components were below the State Average this year. We were actually above the state average in all the areas:

ELA Performance - 58%

ELA Learning Gains - 63%

ELA Lowest 25% - 63%

MATH Performance - 65%

MATH Learning Gains - 65%

MATH Lowest 25% - 52%

SCIENCE PERFORMANCE - 64%

By Grade level our 3rd Grade ELA had the biggest gap compared to the state average. We were 51% proficient and the state average was 58%.

3rd, 4th, and 5th Grade Comparisons:

ELA STATE - 58,58,60

ELA CES - 51,55,62

MATH STATE - 62,64,60

MATH CES - 63,63,63

SCIENCE STATE - 53

SCIENCE CES - 64

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

Due to COVID-19 our data is from 2018-2019 - Our Science Scores showed the most improvement from 51% (2017-2018) to 63% (2018-2019). Our Science scores over the past five years have drastically increased. They have increased an average of 8% each year.

2014-2015: 21%

2015-2016: 37%

2016-2017: 42%

2017-2018: 51%

2018-2019: 63%

Each grade is responsible for certain Science topics to be covered throughout the year. We have also included the use of non-fiction science passages during our ELA block, a Science lab, and monitoring of Baseline Science data for 3rd-5th grades.

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

Due to COVID-19 our data is from 2018-2019 - Attendance and 3rd Grade Level 1's are areas of concerns according to our Early Warning System. There are not any consequences in place for not attending school and most of our Level 1's in 3rd grade should have been retained in previous years during 1st or 2nd grade.

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

Due to COVID-19 our data is from 2018-2019:

1. MATH LEARNING GAINS in LOWEST 25%
2. ELA PERFORMANCE
3. ELA LEARNING GAINS in LOWEST 25%

4. MATH LEARNING GAINS
5. ELA PERFORMANCE

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Not enough time during the school day and lack of understanding of how important Student Engagement can be in the learning process.
Measurable Outcome:	More students will be proficient in 3rd-5th grades in ELA, MATH, and SCIENCE. Our goal is to be proficient in: ELA - at least 58% MATH - at least 65% SCIENCE - at least 65%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Carter (carterme@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom Observations and Lesson Plan checks quarterly from 8/24/2020 - 5/30/2021. We will also discuss how to utilize AVID strategies during our PLC and Grade level meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have found that the more students are engaged and cooperating in learning, the more successful they are in meeting grade level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will meet once a week to plan with their Grade level as well as have a PLC with the administrators. Implementing AVID strategies will definitely help with having student engagement activities incorporated within their lessons. Utilizing small groups daily, technology, manipulatives, Expeditionary Learning, and the Science Lab are all ways that teachers can increase student engagement.

*Small Groups - All support staff will be able to assist teachers when implementing activities and lessons for the students.

*Technology - Classroom technology such as document cameras, interactive boards, and chromebooks/tablets will allow teachers to plan lessons for the class so that the students are more involved in the learning process as well as get instruction on their individualized level.

*Manipulatives - Will be used so that students can have a deeper understanding of the content and work collaboratively to come up with the solutions.

*Expeditionary Learning - ELA Curriculum with rigorous content that allows students to be active in discussions as well as writing activities.

*Science Lab - Teachers will be able to take their students into the lab to work with hands on Science activities

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If teachers implement purposeful, rigorous, standards-based instruction by utilizing data to plan and drive small group instruction, then there will be an increase in the number of proficient students for Reading and Math.

Measurable Outcome:
 ELA - at least 58%
 MATH - at least 65%
 SCIENCE - at least 65%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Carter (carterme@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Lesson Plans will be checked on a regular basis, weekly iReady reports, and Standards mastery reports will be monitored as needed. The Diagnostic data is used as week to determine students' placement in groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Meeting the needs of each student in small groups help with closing the achievement gaps for the students.

Action Steps to Implement

We will use the District curriculum pacing guide when implementing small group instruction. Each class will have a support staff scheduled to them for 45-60 minutes daily for small group instruction. Teachers will meet with their grade group weekly as well as during PLC's to discuss what content is needing attention. Administrators will help teachers evaluate data and determine the needs and who/what need extra attention.

Person Responsible: Melissa Carter (carterme@hendry-schools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will look at rescheduling groups for 3rd grade during the 2nd semester to help with the students' needs in Reading. Also, we will try and reward the students differently for attendance to try to motivate them to be here daily.

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.

When building a positive culture and environment for our staff, students, parents, and community we make sure to offer a variety of events that are family oriented. Due to COVID-19, our regular scheduled events are will not happen until possibly the Spring of 2021. We also use Social Media to keep our families engaged and communicate with the community about happenings at Central Elementary School.

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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00