Steinhatchee School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Steinhatchee School

1209 SE 1ST AVE, Steinhatchee, FL 32359

https://www.edline.net/pages/steinhatchee_school

Demographics

Principal: James Bray   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
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)	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (92%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Adminitrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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.](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

Steinhatchee School

1209 SE 1ST AVE, Steinhatchee, FL 32359

https://www.edline.net/pages/steinhatchee_school

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	1%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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.

At Steinhatchee School our staff, parents, and community are committed to providing a quality education for all students to become lifelong learners and responsible, productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Steinhatchee School envisions every child to be a lifelong learner who is a responsible, productive, and caring citizen.

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
Bray, James	Principal	
Stefanelli, Martha	Teacher, K-12	
Lilliott, Laurie	Teacher, K-12	
Carmichael, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Harden, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, James Bray

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
7

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)	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (92%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	17	17	8	16	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/24/2020

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	6	13	13	7	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	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	6	13	13	7	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	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	91%	73%	57%	44%	47%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	93%	75%	58%	71%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	53%	0%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	91%	78%	63%	36%	47%	61%
Math Learning Gains	93%	78%	62%	53%	49%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	51%	0%	34%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	53%	53%	0%	50%	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	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-60%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	58%	22%	58%	22%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	80%	46%	34%	56%	24%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
Cohort Comparison		80%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	71%	-71%	62%	-62%
	2018	80%	68%	12%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-80%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	67%	3%	64%	6%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		70%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	90%	60%	30%	60%	30%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		90%				
Cohort Comparison		90%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	80%	54%	26%	53%	27%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
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
WHT	95	92		95	92						
FRL	86			93							
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
WHT	37	29		33	19						
FRL	33	27		30	18						
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
WHT	46	71		38	53						
FRL	43	73		38	60						

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	92
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	94
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	90
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.

The writing component of the 2018-2019 FSA ELA was still below the state average. There was improvement from prior years. This was the first year that there were no scores of "0" in writing. Our range was from 4 - 8. We have not had a score over 7 until this year. There were only 2 students that scored a "4".

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

There were no declines from the prior year on the 2018-2019 FSA. The school grade increased from an "F" to an "A". 2019 -2020 I-Ready mid-year progress monitoring data showed an identical trajectory from the prior year.

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 from the 2018-2019 FSA that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was writing. This is an improving data component, but a gap is still present. Steinhatchee School is two years into a school-wide writing approach facilitated by training through Core Connections. Since the content builds progressively as students advance through grade levels there is anticipation of continued improvement if the program is implemented with fidelity.

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

All components on the 2018-2019 FSA increased but Math was the most pronounced in terms of growth and proficiency compared to prior years. There were different instructors for third through fifth grade Math. Steinhatchee is a very small school and the two instructors represented a 100% difference in delivery of instruction. Additionally, LSI provided professional development in target-task alignment and success criteria that were particularly instrumental in boosting student performance.

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

One potential area of concern in is student attendance. The EWS data in Part I (D) indicated that 10% of students had a 90% or less attendance rate. There is also concern about the difficulty in maintaining consistent success, given that Steinhatchee School has never maintained an "A" for consecutive years.

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

1. Text-Based Writing
2. Comprehending Informational Text
3. Vocabulary
4. Attendance
5. Growth Mindset/Attitude

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the most recent FSA assessed school year of 2018-2019, 93% of students showed a year's worth of learning gains on FSA and 91% scored proficient. However, the average student score in the text based writing category was still below state average. For this reason, text-based writing is continuing as an area of focus for Steinhatchee's School Improvement Plan.
Measurable Outcome:	The average Fourth and Fifth grade student score will be at or above the state average in the text-based writing category on the Spring 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Bray (james.bray@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Core Connections will provide professional development through modeling of best instructional practices in the classroom for teachers with their specific students in order to enhance instruction for text-based writing. This is reinforced with reflective discussions and next steps after the modeling instruction takes place. Core Connections provides a comprehensive approach to text-based writing across grade levels including how to analyze prompts, deconstruct text, and formulate a writing plan that follows a specific process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Core Connections program is designed to support students with text-based writing skills that build incrementally. As students continue to advance through grades the continuity of using and building upon Core Connections strategies from the prior year as part of a school-wide approach should continue to yield improvement to text-based writing.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide 4 Core Connections Writing Professional Development Days for Teachers
2. Use the Core Connections walk-through checklist to ensure that strategies are being implemented in the classroom.
3. Monitor student performance through the Write Score progress monitoring assessment 3 times a year.
4. Check teacher lesson plans for documentation of text-based writing instruction implementation.
5. Work collaboratively with Core Connections facilitators to provide teachers feedback on text-based writing instruction.

Person Responsible James Bray (james.bray@taylor.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is Comprehending Informational Text. This is based on reviewing I-Ready progress monitoring data for that specific domain from the 2019-2020 school year as well as prior year FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	62% or more of 3-5 grade students will score proficient in the Comprehending Informational Text domain on the final I-Ready progress monitoring for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Bray (james.bray@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Core Connections Program of connecting reading with writing to improve informational text comprehension will be implemented through professional development, classroom modeling and systematic installation of their program strategies. I-Ready specialized learning paths for each student will help build foundational skills to promote informational text comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Since both of our Areas of Focus relate to Informational Text proficiency, Core Connections is the ideal method of improving both text-based writing and comprehension of informational text simultaneously.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan four days of Core Connections professional development.
2. Monitor use of Core Connections strategies in the classroom through the Principal checklist, lesson plans, and observing instructional practices.
3. Track Write Score progress monitoring that will be administered 3 times during the school year.
4. Monitor growth using I-Ready through diagnostics 3 times per year to measure the comprehending informational text domain and standards mastery will be utilized throughout the year on a bi-weekly basis to gauge Florida Standards specifically ties to informational texts.

Person Responsible	James Bray (james.bray@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The additional area of concern was attendance. Steinhatchee School will encourage attendance by communicating with parents to ensure that absences that are not health related are kept to a minimum. Attendance will continue to be prioritized while simultaneously ensuring that students with health related absences are not penalized.

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.

Steinhatchee School builds a positive culture through collaboration with all school community stakeholders. We provide frequent information updates through our school Face Book page and Class Dojo communication app. Our Parent Involvement Team (PIT) meets virtually through "Microsoft Teams" and parents receive email invitations to the meetings upon request. PIT provides input to school staff and provides student as well as teacher support. Our community wide School Advisory Council (SAC) meets monthly to help drive decision making in the best interest of students. Community based "Character Education" lines up local business sponsors for each class as well as every school related staff member. Character Education also coordinates with the school to sponsor community events throughout the school year. Steinhatchee School also shares campus space with the Boys and Girls Club. Approximately half of our students attend in the afternoons and Steinhatchee teachers communicate with Boys and Girls Club teachers on how to best assist specific students.

Steinhatchee School hosts individual parent conferences multiple times per year. Due to current visitation restrictions, parents are reached during scheduled conference nights through the principal sharing update videos on Class Dojo and the Steinhatchee School Face Book page. Teachers contact parents virtually and by phone to discuss student achievement. The first conference was held in September and focused on prior year data, a review of the progress monitoring assessment results, research based ways that parents can help at home as well as gathering information from the parent. The second conference will be held during February and will focus on the latest progress monitoring assessments, the status of the student in relation to the Florida standards and ways that parents may assist at home.

Other ways that Steinhatchee School informs parents is through report cards, newsletters, STAR parent letters, iReady parent letters, and individual Reading and Math Deficient letters that parents are asked to sign and return. Since SS does not have any ELL students all material is in English. If the case arises where ELL students need to be served, we will use technology to translate and interpret.

If restrictions permit, Steinhatchee School will work with the Boys and Girls Club to host a Thanksgiving Feast in November.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.