

School Board of Levy County

Cedar Key High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	25
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Cedar Key High School

951 WHIDDON AVE, Cedar Key, FL 32625

<http://www.levyk12.org/schools>

Demographics

Principal: Joshua Slemp

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	25
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Cedar Key High School

951 WHIDDON AVE, Cedar Key, FL 32625

<http://www.levyk12.org/schools>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	8%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

Cedar Key School, in conjunction with the community, will provide an education for our students that will encourage them to become academically proficient, life-long learners, skilled communicators and problem-solvers, and productive citizens of their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cedar Key School's vision is for all students to graduate career and college ready, possessing the skills for future success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lawrence, Kathy	Principal	The principal works with the Lead Team to drive the educational plan of the school. The principal develops Lead Team members into School Improvement leaders: they study data, help assess progress towards goals, make course corrections, help implement change, and serve as liaisons between the faculty and the administration for open communication regarding school initiatives. The principal conducts school improvement professional development sessions and holds regular data chats with individual teachers, teacher groups, and students. The principal implements, monitors, and makes adjustments to all school improvement initiatives.
Webb, Jeffrey	Dean	Mr. Jeffrey Webb is the Dean of Students; he supports the academic goals as well as the attendance and behavior goals of this SIP. Mr. Webb teaches math classes in addition to serving as dean, and he helps lead the math department in setting goals and implementing math initiatives.
Campbell, Linda	Reading Coach	Linda, as the school's reading coach, is responsible for supporting ELA goals. She provides professional development, coaches and models in classes, and helps organize reading interventions across the grade levels.
Voyles, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Karen is the lead teacher for the middle school. She leads the teachers in middle school in working toward our ELA and math goals.
Hudson-Lane, Jennie	School Counselor	Jennie-Lynn supports the school with behavioral counseling and works with the SIP Lead Team to support our goals. She ensures that our graduates are college- and career-ready, and she works to reduce the struggles of our students in the Early Warning System. She also coordinates with the Mental Health Provider services to students.
Andrews, Kearston	Teacher, K-12	Kearston is the fourth and fifth grade math and science teacher on staff and leads the elementary teachers in working toward our ELA and math goals. She attends district meetings on math initiatives and shares the information and training with our staff.
Adams, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Lauren is a middle and high school ELA teacher and the school's testing coordinator. She helps lead the effort to make our ELA goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/23/2018, Joshua Slemp

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.*

6

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

221

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	17	14	15	13	15	13	19	11	5	23	21	24	21	211
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	7
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	1	3	10	6	5	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	1	1	3	14	4	6	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	2	4	3	0	2	1	1	3	10	6	5	38

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	2	0	2	1	0	1	10	2	4	22

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	2	2	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	3	9	3	6	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	3	7	1	0	0	0	23

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

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	1	0	2	2	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	7	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	3	9	3	6	0	0	32	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	3	7	1	0	0	0	23	

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				48%	46%	61%	49%	44%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	48%	59%	61%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	46%	54%	61%	48%	52%
Math Achievement				57%	51%	62%	56%	49%	61%
Math Learning Gains				55%	51%	59%	56%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	42%	52%	48%	40%	52%
Science Achievement				64%	54%	56%	62%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				88%	78%	78%	93%	76%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	48%	-10%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	13%	44%	-31%	56%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2021					
	2019	58%	41%	17%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2021					
	2019	22%	37%	-15%	52%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	9%	36%	-27%	56%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
09	2021					
	2019	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
10	2021					
	2019	75%	50%	25%	53%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	53%	-26%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
06	2021					
	2019	68%	45%	23%	55%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
07	2021					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	54%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	29%	-29%	46%	-46%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	72%	43%	29%	48%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	66%	26%	67%	25%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	85%	72%	13%	71%	14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	68%	26%	70%	24%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	55%	57%	-2%	61%	-6%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	53%	26%	57%	22%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grades K-8, ELA and Math--i-Ready diagnostics

Alg. 1--district-created assessments

Grades 9-12 ELA--FAIR

Social Studies and Science--district-created assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	2/13%	3/20%	9/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/13%	3/20%	9/53%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/6%	1/7%	7/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/6%	1/7%	7/41%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3/30%	3/27%	7/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/30%	3/27%	7/58%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	1/9%	5/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	1/9%	5/42%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/50%	5/38%	7/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/50%	5/38%	7/44%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	1/8%	4/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	1/8%	4/25%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/25%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/43%	6/43%	7/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/43%	6/43%	7/50%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/14%	1/7%	4/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/14%	1/7%	4/29%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	2/14%	3/25%	3/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/14%	3/25%	3/27%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/7%	0/0%	3/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/7%	0/0%	3/27%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/100%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	3/30%	7/55%	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/30%	7/55%	--
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4/29%	3/23%	2/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/29%	3/23%	2/15%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0/0%	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/15%	1/8%	1/7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/15%	1/8%	1/7%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0/0%	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/11%	1/17%	3/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/11%	1/17%	3/60%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/11%	0/0%	1/20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/11%	0/0%	1/20%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/17%	4/24%	5/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/17%	4/24%	5/29%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/42%	5/23%	7/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/42%	5/23%	7/30%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/25%	2/10%	5/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/25%	2/10%	5/23%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/37%	8/49%	7/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/37%	8/49%	7/41%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/67%	5/28%	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/67%	5/28%	--
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	7/29%	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	7/29%	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	0/0%	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/79%	1/8%	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/79%	1/8%	--
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	11/50%	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	11/50%	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	0/0%	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/62%	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/62%	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/42%	4/19%	7/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/42%	4/19%	7/43%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	--	N/A	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--	--	--
	Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--
	Students With Disabilities	--	--	--
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	29	33		30	29						
WHT	49	57	59	43	41	38	60	74	69	95	95
FRL	45	48	55	39	41	38	58	64		90	

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	27	55	50	27	50	50					
WHT	49	43	45	57	56	50	64	87	68	100	56
FRL	44	44	46	46	52	55	51	92	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	24	50	50	25	47		30				
HSP	73			55	60						
WHT	50	59	57	58	59	48	62	91	63		
FRL	41	56	59	49	50	50	53	92	50		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
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	684
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

From the FSA data, we see that ELA achievement is steady, and learning gains are almost back to 2018 levels after dipping in 2019. We have lost ground in math achievement. While we were just below the state average for achievement and learning gains in 2019, we are now far below (loss of 10-15 points in each category).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Mathematics, both achievement and learning gains overall and of the lowest quartile

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We believe that the shutdown during Spring 2020 and the multiple quarantines of the 2020-2021 school year contributed to our learning loss in mathematics. We are going to add math intervention periods to the elementary class schedule, focus schoolwide on more application/word problems, and focus efforts on cohorts of students that need remediation/acceleration.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains of everyone and the lowest quartile

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Change of staff at the elementary level

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will continue our schoolwide AVID strategies of focused note-taking and levels of questioning to increase retention of learning, metacognition, and rigor.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will continue to provide additional professional development of focused note-taking, levels of questioning, and collaboration to deepen our knowledge and standardize our instructional practices schoolwide. We will add professional development opportunities to our math teachers to help them teach more conceptual knowledge in math classes; professional development will include concepts from the Levy Math Institute, the GNAW graphic organizer, and instructional strategies for teaching real-world problems.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Our district has invested in AVID in all of our schools, and that support will ensure sustainability of improvement. Also, the principal will continue to work with all faculty to ensure that they all have a school-improvement lens on our school data and strategies implementation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The CKS faculty feels that we need to continue to overcome socioeconomic barriers and prevailing mindsets that work against our students' becoming all that they can be. Students struggle to be organized, to care about doing rigorous classwork and homework, and to have a vision of their future that takes them very far beyond our island home.

Measurable Outcome: ELA learning gains for all students (grades 4-10) as measured by the FSA will increase from 56% to 60%.

Monitoring: Our faculty will implement AVID strategies which support our goals, and we will progress monitor the learning gains and achievement of our students in ELA with i-Ready in grades K-5 and IXL in grades 6-12.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The culture of AVID will be fostered daily throughout the entire Cedar Key School K-12. All teachers will work to increase rigor and organization through the use of WICOR strategies, with an emphasis on levels of questioning, focused note-taking, and collaboration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Focused note-taking increases the retention rate of learning new material. WICOR strategies increase students' ability to comprehend text. Prompting student thinking with increased levels of questioning raises students' critical thinking.

Action Steps to Implement

All students on campus are provided with binders and planners to enhance organizational skills. All teachers add items to the students' planners and notebooks to help students stay organized, and binder checks are conducted by instructional staff each nine weeks. Teachers will display "AVID in Action" work at least monthly to self-monitor their use of our four focus strategies.

All teachers receive ongoing training in focused note-taking, WICOR, levels of questioning, and collaboration through professional development sessions led by our district AVID Lead Teacher. Teachers work collaboratively with other Levy teachers during three SIP Days; we also work together on campus through two rounds of Lesson Study. The principal includes all of the SIP strategies as look-fors in regular classroom walkthrough data collection and reports to the staff the implementation data. The AVID Lead Team and principal also monitor implementation each month as part of their monthly meeting agendas.

Person Responsible: Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The CKS faculty feels that we need to continue to overcome socioeconomic barriers and prevailing mindsets that work against our students' becoming all that they can be. Students struggle to be organized, to care about doing rigorous classwork and homework, and to have a vision of their future that takes them very far beyond our island home.
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains for all students (grades 4-10) as measured on Math state assessments will increase from 42% to 50%.
Monitoring:	Our faculty will implement AVID strategies which support our goals, and we will progress monitor the learning gains and achievement of our students in mathematics with i-Ready in grades K-5 and IXL in grades 6-12.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The culture of AVID will be fostered daily throughout the entire Cedar Key School K-12. All teachers will work to increase rigor and organization through the use of WICOR strategies, with an emphasis on levels of questioning, focused note-taking, and collaboration. To increase math learning gains, we will increase intervention opportunities at the elementary level, provide additional supports to struggling cohorts of high school students, increase the use of real-world problems schoolwide, and embed more spiral review into the curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focused note-taking increases the retention rate of learning new material. WICOR strategies increase students' ability to comprehend text. Prompting student thinking with increased levels of questioning raises students' critical thinking. Additional time on task in mathematics should yield an increase in math performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will include the AVID strategies of focused note-taking, levels of questioning, WICOR, and collaboration in all math classes to increase organization and retention of material.
2. We will provide an additional period of math intervention in grades K-5 and math tutorial periods for high school students.
3. Bell-ringers in all math classes will be comprised of math facts to increase fluency in computation.
4. We will increase motivation for learning math by infusing more real-world problems in everyday learning, by inviting guest speakers to talk about the math connections in their jobs, and by creating short informational videos to show show parents how current math problems can be solved.

The principal includes all of the SIP strategies as look-fors in regular classroom walkthrough data collection and reports to the staff the implementation data.

Person Responsible Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The student behaviors and discipline data show that most students are respectful of staff and follow school rules. We have very few incidents which require out of school suspension. Our biggest challenge lies in motivating students who are out of school due to quarantines to work on school assignments and stay current with the rest of the class.

We will continue to monitor those students who accrue multiple referrals per quarter; currently, we average 3 students per quarter who receive three or more referrals during the nine weeks. We would like to reduce that number to 0.

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.

CKS is taking a multi-pronged approach to build a positive school culture and environment by ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

--Students are involved with the school-wide integration of the AVID program with emphasis on growth mindset which leads the way to developing a positive school culture.

--All students work to pursue goals for future success by partnering with faculty experts, community supporters, college representatives, business leaders and mentors, parents, social services providers, and others.

--The faculty meets regularly to focus on how to advance a positive culture and environment. The Lead Team meets monthly to plan school events after seeking input and advice from the students and faculty at large. The AVID Lead Team meets monthly to promote the ongoing implementation of the AVID strategies to build an AVID culture at the school. The Literacy Team meets throughout the year to plan literacy events that engage students, family and the community.

--SAC - The school advisory team is made up of both school employees and community members who provide insight and advice on how to further improve both the activities and the culture of our school. Local businesses, City Commissioners, the University of Florida, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service personnel are strategic partners on our SAC.

--PTO - Faculty, staff and parents work monthly on programs to benefit our students, which result in a more positive environment. Members of local organizations work on our PTO to support our students by helping raise funds and plan events for them.

--We maintain an open-door policy and welcome feedback and involvement from parents and families; we are responsive to their needs.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

In addition to the stakeholders within the school listed above, the following entities support a positive culture at Cedar Key School:

--The Cedar Key community embraces the activities of our school and students. They are heavily involved in providing guest speakers to student groups, raising funds for student scholarships, and volunteering with our sports, arts, academic, and CTE programs.

--Our aquaculture program maintains a model partnership with the University of Florida, the College of Central Florida, the City of Cedar Key, and the Cedar Key Aquaculture Association.

--The district supports our efforts to reach out to all stakeholders by providing ongoing professional development to our staff on family engagement.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00