Santa Rosa County School District

Central 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 22

Budget to Support Goals 0

Central School

6180 CENTRAL SCHOOL RD, Milton, FL 32570

www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/chs/

Demographics

Principal: Klint Lay

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

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)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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 12

Planning for Improvement 18

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Central School

6180 CENTRAL SCHOOL RD, Milton, FL 32570

www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/chs/

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	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	10%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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.

Central School's mission is to provide all students with an inclusive learning environment while preparing students for career and college readiness. We are committed to providing a superior and relevant education while fostering a community of life-long learners with the disposition to share their skills and talents in the community in which they serve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision for our students is to create lifelong learners who are equipped to compete in the classroom, enabled to excel beyond the challenge in front of them, and empowered to serve others in whatever capacity they are called upon to serve.

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
Twitty, Sean	Principal	Oversight of all grade levels to include discipline, curriculum, and athletics
Davis, Cheree	Assistant Principal	Oversight of Guidance and Curriculum for K-12 grades
Majzen, Adriane	Other	Academic Intervention Specialist- provides reading intervention for K-2 students
McDaniel, Brennis	Teacher, K-12	Middle and High School math and department chair-coordinates our secondary math efforts and teaches our upper level math classes in grades 8-12
Gault, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Elementary Teacher- 1st Grade, Renaissance contact for Accelerated Reader, STEAM Innovator
Payne, Selene	Teacher, K-12	Middle school reading, ELA, and department chair-Teaches 7th grade language arts classes, provides reading intervention through intensive reading classes, and coordinates all secondary language arts/English efforts for our secondary grade levels
Skelley, Alaina	Teacher, K-12	Middle and high school science teacher- teaches Biology and Chemistry. Helps coordinate secondary science efforts for our teachers and students
Wright, Keirsten	Teacher, K-12	Middle and high school ESE, social studies, and department chair-Teaches psychology/sociology classes, high school intensive reading classes, and World History. Coordinates all social studies efforts for our secondary teachers and students
Holland, Melinda	Teacher, K-12	Elementary Math Interventionist- provides math intervention for K-5 students. Coordinates STEAM efforts for grades K-12
Seals, Loretta	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade teacher-coordinates math curriculum for elementary level teachers
Garrett, Tracey	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Social Studies, English, and Science teacher
Golden, Nick	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Math teacher
Amos, Anthia	Teacher, K-12	10th and 12th grade English and Dual Enrollment English
Butler, Jennifer	School Counselor	6-12th Grade counselor
Hudson, Denise	School Counselor	Elementary PreK-5 counselor

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/15/2020, Klint Lay

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.*
2

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
53

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)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	29	21	24	24	13	32	29	84	88	61	64	70	54	593
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	2	2	0	4	0	2	6	3	5	5	3	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	11	18	4	3	4	1	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	1	1	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	7	1	3	1	0	15
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	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	9	2	2	2	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	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	23	27	26	16	34	25	52	91	73	67	76	46	52	608
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	7	5	5	4	13	14	7	12	11	7	9	114
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	0	1	1	6	6	10	4	7	6	5	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	0	2	2	0	10	12	4	12	4	4	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	3	7	6	26	9	12	11	0	0	79

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	3	2	0	5	5	16	9	24	15	20	15	10	124

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	4	1	6	3	13	6	10	11	11	9	8	83
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4

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	23	27	26	16	34	25	52	91	73	67	76	46	52	608
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	7	5	5	4	13	14	7	12	11	7	9	114
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	0	1	1	6	6	10	4	7	6	5	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	0	2	2	0	10	12	4	12	4	4	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	3	7	6	26	9	12	11	0	0	79

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	3	2	0	5	5	16	9	24	15	20	15	10	124

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	4	1	6	3	13	6	10	11	11	9	8	83
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4

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	52%	62%	61%	52%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	48%	59%	51%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	54%	47%	48%	51%
Math Achievement	56%	62%	62%	43%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	46%	50%	59%	41%	44%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	36%	52%	38%	39%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	66%	56%	54%	63%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	69%	78%	56%	71%	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	37%	71%	-34%	58%	-21%
	2018	52%	66%	-14%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	66%	-14%	58%	-6%
	2018	36%	66%	-30%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	62%	69%	-7%	56%	6%
	2018	50%	64%	-14%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				
06	2019	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
	2018	35%	60%	-25%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	46%	59%	-13%	52%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	60%	56%	4%	51%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	62%	68%	-6%	56%	6%
	2018	57%	71%	-14%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
09	2019	53%	65%	-12%	55%	-2%
	2018	45%	61%	-16%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
10	2019	33%	64%	-31%	53%	-20%
	2018	61%	65%	-4%	53%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	73%	71%	2%	62%	11%
	2018	76%	73%	3%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	73%	-30%	64%	-21%
	2018	38%	74%	-36%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2019	59%	71%	-12%	60%	-1%
	2018	47%	70%	-23%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
06	2019	53%	66%	-13%	55%	-2%
	2018	44%	63%	-19%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	35%	54%	-19%	54%	-19%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	54%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	62%	76%	-14%	46%	16%
	2018	49%	77%	-28%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	67%	65%	2%	53%	14%
	2018	53%	66%	-13%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	53%	62%	-9%	48%	5%
	2018	48%	66%	-18%	50%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	95%	86%	9%	67%	28%
2018	58%	69%	-11%	65%	-7%
Compare		37%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	51%	75%	-24%	71%	-20%
2018	64%	75%	-11%	71%	-7%
Compare		-13%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	71%	78%	-7%	70%	1%
2018	63%	78%	-15%	68%	-5%
Compare		8%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	89%	73%	16%	61%	28%
2018	38%	67%	-29%	62%	-24%
Compare		51%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	34%	66%	-32%	57%	-23%
2018	42%	65%	-23%	56%	-14%
Compare		-8%			

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	16	47	46	33	45	50	27	31			
HSP	42										
MUL	73	55		70	70						
WHT	52	54	52	55	45	38	66	58	45	83	50
FRL	50	53	53	54	43	34	59	57	43	72	42

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	23	27	18	32	39	30	33	36			
MUL	62			62							
WHT	52	47	35	47	44	32	54	67	47	86	32
FRL	50	47	35	48	44	29	52	64	39	84	31

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	14	40	44	16	40	50	7	9			
WHT	52	50	48	43	41	40	55	56	49	96	28
FRL	47	48	46	41	40	37	42	51	40	90	17

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	
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	42
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	67
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	54
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	51
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 data component for Math showed the lowest performance with 25-40% proficiency. The contributing factors to last year's low performance was student attendance, students who check out early, or check in late. These students often failed to complete makeup work or attend tutoring sessions. This contributed to be one of the biggest factors with our lowest 25%. Monitoring student data and conferencing with students frequently was lacking in some classes.

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 Social Studies Civics. Contributing factors to this are school attendance and the lack of explicit instruction needed to help students understand the purpose of goal setting and how to monitor student progress towards those goals.

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 of Social Studies had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with a -18% proficiency. Contributing factors to this are school attendance and the lack of explicit instruction needed to help students understand the purpose of goal setting and how to monitor student progress towards those goals.

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 ELA lowest 25%. The actions our school took in this area was adjusting teaching assignments and holding data chats with teachers more frequently. Teachers where encouraged to participate in professional development that was based on the needs of their classroom. Teachers also worked with the MTSS Team to provide intervention that target specific skills.

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

Based on the EWS data students with one or more suspensions as well as school attendance are two of the largest areas of concern for Central School.

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

1. Attendance
2. Social Studies Civics Achievement
3. Math Achievement and Learning Gains
4. ESE Achievement and Learning Gains
5. ELA Achievement and Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The greatest decline from the 2019-2020 school year was in the area of Civics. This area of student achievement dropped nearly 6%. However, when analyzing the data, it was identified that our proficiency rate for the Civics EOC fell by 13% putting Central School below both the state and district proficiency scores.
Measurable Outcome:	Central School's overall Social Studies proficiency rate will increase by a minimum of 7%, and our Civics EOC proficiency rate will increase by 15%. Our overall goal is to increase Social Studies proficiency rate to at least 69% to align with our district proficiency rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Twitty (twittys@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data from the Performance Matters Assessment will be used by Civics teachers to create an action plan that targets areas of weakness. This plan will be shared with administrators during regular data chats. Focus will be placed on students who lack proficiency in these areas. Further progress monitoring data will be used to address overall deficiencies in mastery of all Civics standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit instruction of unpacked standards using Civics 360 resources and content area literacy strategies will enable students to improve their understanding of course content. Informal assessments, peer tutoring, and self grading (Hattie, 2009) will be used to positively impact student achievement. Active participation with purposeful expectations will enable students to set achievable learning goals and monitor their progress towards these goals. (Hattie, 2009; Fisher, Frey & Hattie, 2016)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will administer and analyze Performance Matters data to develop instructional plans and establish goals to address weaknesses and concerns derived from data.
2. Teachers will use content area literacy strategies to assist students in accessing course content through the use of visible literacy strategies and Civics 360 resources.
3. Teachers will provide student feedback and reteach content when necessary.

Person Responsible	Keirsten Wright (wrightk@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Central School's Math achievement increased from 49% to 56% proficient for the 2018-2019 school year. However, these scores fall below state and district percentages. The data indicates that there was a 33% drop in student proficiency between 3rd and 4th grade and a 9% drop in proficiency between 6th and 7th grade. Additionally, Central's proficiency rate for Geometry EOC dropped 8%.
Measurable Outcome:	Central School's goal for the 2020-2021 school year is to demonstrate continuous improvement in the area of Mathematics. The goal is for our overall proficiency rate to increase from 56% to 60% proficiency. Targeting 4th grade, 7th grade, and Geometry instruction. Our goal for 4th grade is to have 70% of students demonstrate grade level proficiency. Our goal for 7th grade is to have 45% of students demonstrate grade level proficiency and for the passing rate on the Geometry EOC to increase to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Twitty (twittys@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math teachers will analyze STAR progress monitoring data and determine a plan of action to target areas of weakness based on data results. Teachers will focus on non-proficient students addressing specific areas that require explicit instruction. Of the 6th to 12th grade students assessed 13% are identified as students with a disability. To support those students students will be assigned an ESE certified teacher to support instruction in the core classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy of providing one on one instruction is based on Mr. Hattie's research that states students receiving one-on-one instruction fosters student achievement when instruction is adapted based on the needs of the student. (Hattie, 2020)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will administer and analyze STAR Assessments in order to develop instructional plans to address student weaknesses.
2. Teachers will participate in district level professional development.
3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction to students, provide student feedback, and reteach any missed standards or content.
4. Teachers will utilize Microsoft Teams or other electronic means to communicate with students in an effort to address attendance concerns.

Person Responsible	Brennis McDaniel (mcdanielb@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Central School's ELA achievement dropped by 1%. The data indicates a slight decrease in student proficiency scores between 9th and 10th grade of 4%.
Measurable Outcome:	Central School's goal is to increase ELA proficiency rates by 10%, from 52% proficient to 62% proficient to align with both district and state proficiency rates.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Twitty (twittys@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring data from STAR ELA assessments will be used to identify areas of strength as well as need. To ensure student growth focusing on current needs and projected mastery of standards, ELA teachers will develop an action plan to be shared with administration during data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Adherence to fidelity within core instruction that emphasizes high-impact approaches such as questioning, teacher clarity, and effective feedback (Fisher, Frey & Hattie, 2016) will enable ELA teachers to ensure mastery of standards. Professional development opportunities focusing on effective implementation of high-impact strategies will create a unified vision within the department, which will support successful student learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will administer and analyze STAR ELA data to develop specific instructional plans to address weaknesses derived from the data.
2. Teachers will provide explicit core instruction using high-impact strategies.
3. Teachers will use informal assessments to monitor progress towards mastery of standards.
4. Teachers will participate in school and district level ELA professional development.
5. Teachers will use incentives to encourage student growth in the area of ELA.

Person Responsible	Selene Payne (paynes@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Central School's Attendance Rate for the 2018-2019 school year was 93.29%. School attendance directly impacts student achievement, therefore focusing on increasing student attendance will allow students more instructional time in the classroom to learn any missed content.
Measurable Outcome:	Central School's goal is to improve yearly attendance rate to 96% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheree Davis (davisrc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Central School has designated school personnel to monitor school attendance closely on a daily basis. Upon identifying an attendance issue parents will be notified. Central School will work in partnership with parents to identify barriers that contribute to poor attendance. The school will also work with parents to identify a solution to overcome barriers identified. While also helping parents recognize what they can do to foster good attendance habits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Attendance Works research indicates that poor attendance influences whether children read proficiently by the end of third grade. It is proven that a lack of reading proficiency is a leading indicator for student drop out. Tracking student attendance and intervening before students become truant allows students a greater opportunity to be successful in the classroom. Attendanceworks.org[online]https://www.attandanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Attendance-in-the-Early-Grades.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

1. School personnel to monitor daily attendance.
2. Attendance report ran daily to identify students who have missed three days or more.
3. Parent notification sent home to inform parents/guardians of possible attendance issues and a conference request for students who have missed five days or more.
4. Truancy Plan will be started on students who have missed 10 or more days.
5. Perfect Attendance Awards will be given after each 9 weeks.

Person Responsible Cheree Davis (davisrc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data shows that overall our ESE achievement increased during the 2018-2019 school year. However, achievement for students with disabilities fell in the areas of ELA, Science, and Social Studies. ELA fell from 23% to 16% proficiency, Science fell from 33% to 27% proficiency, and Social Studies fell from 36% to 31% proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Central School's goal is for continuous improvement is to increase achievement of our students with disabilities. Increasing Science proficiency to 35%, ELA proficiency to 30%, and Social Studies proficiency to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Twitty (twittys@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Central's classroom teachers will work in partnership with ESE teachers to support students with disabilities. ESE teachers will closely monitor coursework, provide strategies to help improve study skills, and assist students with managing courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This approach in aiding students with disabilities by teaching study skills has been proven to be effective when combined with course content to foster a deeper level of understanding. (Hattie, 2009)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students with disabilities will be assigned an ESE teacher to provide assistance in core classes.
2. ESE teachers will monitor coursework notifying parents of student progress as needed.
3. Students with disabilities will be placed into Learning Strategies course to teach students study skills.
4. ESE teachers will support students through Microsoft Teams or other electronic communication.

Person Responsible	Cheree Davis (davisrc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

After identifying the areas of focus the school leadership team will address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities identified in EWS data that indicates one or more suspensions to be an area of weakness for Central School. To address this area school administration will hold class meetings to emphasize discipline infractions and consequences. Students placed in in-school suspension will be assigned Ripple Effect coursework that addresses appropriate responses and actions. School mentors will be assigned to students identified as at risk as deemed necessary. The school has also installed new school security to help identify areas that may need increased school personnel presence.

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.

Central School plans to foster a positive partnership with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission. To foster this relationship, we will encourage stakeholders to play an active role in our schools' agenda. We will involve parents, families, and stakeholders in decisions that directly relate to their child's education. As a school we will work to educate all stakeholders of our school goals and how we plan to achieve the goals set. We will also host parent involvement activities throughout the school year to educate parents, be proactive in helping students be successful in the classroom and celebrate student success. As a school we will increase our presence on social media and host virtual events in the event of restricted.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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