Okeechobee Achievement Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Okeechobee Achievement Academy

1000 NW 34TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://okeechobeeachievementacademy.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: Audie Ash

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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

Okeechobee Achievement Academy

1000 NW 34TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://okeechobeeachievementacademy.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year	2012-13
Grade	

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.

Okeechobee Achievement Academy is committed to providing our students a positive, stimulating, and safe learning environment that promotes the development of individual responsibility, acceptable social skills, and academic growth. Upon entering their next step in education, students will be able to make appropriate decisions and experience success in completing their education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Achieving begins with believing.

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
Van Camp, Bryan	Principal	
Harden, Jennifer	Administrative Support	
Whiteside, Albert	Dean	
Emley, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Presley, Pamela	Administrative Support	
Ash, Audie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Audie Ash

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	1	0	0	1	4	4	3	4	10	25	13	3	9	77
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	14	6	1	5	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	1	8	12	10	3	7	50
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	2	1	1	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	13	7	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	4	8	3	2	2	26

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	1	1	1	6	16	8	2	4	41

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	0	0	2	3	2	2	3	11	9	18	10	10	5	75
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	2	2	3	2	2	1	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	1	1	4	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	17	17	3	0	48

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	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	0	16

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	0	0	0	2	4	0	3	2	3	3	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	2	2	9

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	0	0	2	3	2	2	3	11	9	18	10	10	5	75
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	2	2	3	2	2	1	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	1	1	4	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	17	17	3	0	48

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	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	0	16

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	0	0	0	2	4	0	3	2	3	3	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	2	2	9

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	0%	0%	61%	0%	0%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	0%	59%	0%	0%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	0%	62%	0%	0%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	0%	59%	0%	0%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	0%	56%	0%	0%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	0%	78%	0%	0%	75%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey													
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**													**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	46%	-46%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	9%	38%	-29%	52%	-43%
	2018	17%	32%	-15%	51%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	26%	37%	-11%	56%	-30%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
09	2019	6%	40%	-34%	55%	-49%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
10	2019	40%	46%	-6%	53%	-13%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	66%	-66%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	60%	-60%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	27%	55%	-28%	54%	-27%
	2018	17%	46%	-29%	54%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				
08	2019	5%	51%	-46%	46%	-41%
	2018	17%	54%	-37%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	44%	-44%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	23%	41%	-18%	48%	-25%
	2018	0%	37%	-37%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	65%	-65%
Compare	0%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	59%	-32%	71%	-44%
2018	19%	50%	-31%	71%	-52%
Compare		8%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	52%	-52%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	13%	52%	-39%	61%	-48%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
Compare		13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	47%	-47%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	44%	-44%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	5	35		16	29						
HSP	33	36		15	18						
WHT	6	45		21	50						
FRL	17	37		26	31		20				
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	124
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	77%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	26

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	31
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Our lowest performing subject area was Math. The 22-minute math remedial period was unsuccessful. Students were not motivated because the time was ungraded and less structured than regular class time. We simply did not get the results we expected from this intervention.

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

Our greatest decline was also Math. Again, the remedial period was unsuccessful.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math had the greatest gap in performance in comparison to the state. 17% of our students were proficient (3 or higher) as opposed to 61% of the state.

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

Science showed the most improvement. In 2017-2018, 100% of students were level 1 or 2 in Science. In 2018-2019, 79% of students were level 1 or 2. There were no specific interventions or new resources implemented in our Science classes in 2018-2019.

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

Because we are an alternative school, nearly every one of our students demonstrate at least one of the early warning indicators. Our primary focus will be on retrieving credit for failed courses.

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

1. Improving scores in math, science, and ELA
2. Increase student engagement and time on task in the classroom
3. Differentiation through small group instruction
4. Prescriptive gap closure and remediation with NWEA/Exact Path

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students performing below standard per ESSA Federal Index
Measurable Outcome:	Improve performance of subgroup to meet or exceed federal standards
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-Based Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards-based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize resources: Exact Path, Top Score Writing
2. Modeling of small group instruction by the leadership team
3. Data chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher

Person Responsible   Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students performing below standard according to ESSA Federal Index.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve student performance to meet or exceed the federal standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize resources: Exact Path, Top Score Writing
2. Modeling of small group instruction by the leadership team
3. Data Chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher

Person Responsible   Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students performing below standard per ESSA Federal Index
Measurable Outcome:	Improve student performance to meet or exceed the federal standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize resources: Exact Path, Top Score Writing
2. Modeling of small group instruction by the leadership team
3. Data chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher

Person Responsible   Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students performing below standard per ESSA Federal Index.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve student performance to meet or exceed the federal standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group standards-based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize resources: Exact Path, Top Score Writing
2. Modeling of small group instruction by the leadership team
3. Data chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher

Person Responsible Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Many of our students have experienced various degrees of trauma that affect their ability to perform academically and/or engage in appropriate behavior with peers and adults.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will engage appropriately with peers and staff, and we will see a reduction in referral numbers by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Albert Whiteside (whitesidea@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS and consistent classroom procedures
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	On-task, productive behavior is rewarded. Students have daily incentives to encourage time on task and positive behavior in class.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Classroom Dojo for behavior tracking.
2. Intervention system will remain in place for student behavior; ESE specialist will ensure all teachers are aware of student accommodations and that students are receiving accommodations.
3. Dean will update staff on discipline data and appropriate de-escalation strategies.
4. Implementation of Ripple Effects in elective class and ISS.
5. Daily incentive program to encourage on-task, positive behavior.

Person Responsible Audie Ash (audie.ash@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.

In addition to our academic focus, we have an initiative to improve student motivation. Students have a daily opportunity to earn incentive time prior to lunch and prior to dismissal. Students earn the incentive time through on-task, appropriate behavior that is tracked each class period by the teachers and paraprofessionals. Incentive time is the only acceptable time for students to use their cell phones and devices. They may report to supervised areas in the Life Skills room or the pavilion.

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.

Secondary sites even host a CTE Spotlight where community members, students and parents can attend and learn more about the CTE courses and programs that are available at the secondary level.

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

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: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**