

Okeechobee County School District

# South Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## South Elementary School

2468 SW 7TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

<http://southelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Lonnie Steiert**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/4/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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 10/5/2021.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## South Elementary School

2468 SW 7TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

<http://southelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

### 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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/5/2021.

### 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.

It is the mission of South Elementary School to prepare children for college and career by addressing the needs of the whole child. We create a safe and secure school environment that promotes social and academic growth and develops an enthusiasm for learning.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

SES will create a fun and safe learning environment for all students while instilling an enthusiasm for reading and solid foundation of academic fluency skills in order to prepare students for colleges and careers.

### 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
Streelman, Emily	Principal	Manage classified and instructional staff; evaluate effectiveness of instruction
McCluskey, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	manage discipline, school building maintenance, evaluate classified staff
Tedders , Dana	Instructional Coach	mentor and support teachers instructionally, data analysis and reporting

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/4/2021, Lonnie Steiert

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

46

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

620

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

15

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

7

**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	98	100	104	104	84	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	18	32	23	24	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	6	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	6	27	22	17	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in Math	4	22	30	16	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	10	16	11	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

**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	5	20	25	21	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

**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	8	14	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
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**

Wednesday 8/4/2021

**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	76	104	102	69	75	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	13	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	10	6	3	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	4	3	2	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

**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	11	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	76	104	102	69	75	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	13	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	10	6	3	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	4	3	2	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

**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	11	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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				49%	52%	57%	50%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	54%	58%	51%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	55%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	62%	63%	64%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	57%	62%	73%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	42%	51%	61%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	44%	53%	65%	54%	55%

**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	52%	59%	-7%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	46%	-1%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	66%	-7%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	44%	-4%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The iReady diagnostic assessment.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	106/8%	110/17%	115/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	106/8%	110/17%	115/35%
	Students With Disabilities	22/5%	25/4%	25/8%
	English Language Learners	8/0%	10/0%	11/18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	106/	110/3%	115/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	106/	110/3%	115/23%
	Students With Disabilities	22/	25/0%	25/12%
	English Language Learners	8/	10/0%	11/9%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94/7%	101/19%	106/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94/7%	101/19%	106/35%
	Students With Disabilities	19/11%	21/5%	22/14%
	English Language Learners	7/0%	8/0%	7/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	94/0%	101/4%	106/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	94/0%	101/4%	106/16%
	Students With Disabilities	14/7%	21/5%	22/18%
	English Language Learners	7/0%	8/0%	7/29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70/13%	72/32%	73/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/13%	72/32%	73/42%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0%	21/19%	21/19%
	English Language Learners	9/0%	9/11%	9/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70/1%	72/8%	73/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/1%	72/8%	73/37%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0%	21/5%	21/19%
	English Language Learners	9/0%	9/0%	9/11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82/7%	83/13%	85/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	82/7%	83/13%	85/22%
	Students With Disabilities	25/8%	24/8%	24/8%
	English Language Learners	14/7%	14/7%	14/7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82/0%	83/4%	85/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	82/0%	82/4%	85/15%
	Students With Disabilities	25/0%	24/4%	24/8%
	English Language Learners	14/0%	14/0%	14/0%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71/8%	71/10%	73/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/8%	71/10%	73/15%
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	22/5%	22/0%
	English Language Learners	5/0%	5/0%	5/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/4%	71/7%	73/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/4%	71/7%	73/16%
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	22/5%	22/0%
	English Language Learners	5/0%	5/0%	5/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

**Subgroup Data Review**

<b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b>
SWD	32	30	30	29	13		26				
ELL	38	18		29	9		55				
BLK	7			7							
HSP	43	21		37	11		42				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	55	37	31	44	16		26				
FRL	39	20	50	32	3		20				
<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	24	49	67	38	49	32	15				
ELL	33	43	53	51	45	20	10				
BLK	26	42		39	50						
HSP	43	49	56	54	44	15	25				
WHT	57	58	67	62	57	47	55				
FRL	42	49	64	53	52	39	22				
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	22	33	48	44	44	29	37				
ELL	33	48		44	70						
BLK	30	32		61	84		45				
HSP	48	56	63	59	70	50	57				
WHT	52	49	52	66	72	61	70				
FRL	48	50	52	64	73	63	61				

**ESSA Data Review**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	248
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	7
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	30
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

## 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?

Math is significantly lower performing than ELA, especially with learning gains and gains of the bottom quartile. Students with disabilities, African American students, and ELL students continue to underperform their counter subgroups. Science proficiency dropped along with ELA proficiency.

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

Math learning gains, math bottom quartile learning gains, and science proficiency demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Teacher turnover was one factor. Inappropriate use of the curriculum was another factor. This year, teachers must follow the curriculum map and track the data of individual students in relation to standards mastery. We did not have an instructional coach last year; now that we have one, the coach will be supporting these areas also through collaborative planning and data tracking.

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

3rd grade ELA showed the most improvement.

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

This team stayed consistent throughout the year. The team participated in collaborative planning of rigorous, standards-based instruction, which was a new action.



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

We will implement data tracking, both school-wide and classroom-wide. Students will participate twice a year in student-led conferences. Teachers have choice in the PD they complete to fit their instructional needs.

**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.**

Teachers will engage in professional development with the MTSS platform and process, student engagement, data tracking, and formative assessment.

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

The instructional coach, assistant principal, and principal will conduct weekly walkthroughs of classrooms to leave non-evaluative feedback targeted on the areas of formative assessment, engagement, and/or data tracking.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement****Areas of Focus:****#1. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This is the first year that the administrative team is in tact at SES. With the support of others in these roles, I can spend necessary time in classrooms. Engaging in regular walkthroughs will provide me the opportunity to analyze instructional trends, leave specific feedback to teachers, and, ultimately support teachers' growth, while academic achievement is increasing.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, the lowest quartile of students will increase learning gains by 25% in math and 10% in ELA. Science proficiency will increase by 14%.

**Monitoring:** The iReady diagnostic will help monitor the progress in ELA and math. NWEA will monitor progress in science.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Visibility in classrooms increases academic achievement through the use of targeted support via the administrative staff and instructional coaches.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** My visibility shows students and staff that learning and growth is most important. The administrator also takes on the role of cheerleader in constantly celebrating the successes of students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	According to last year's data (iReady), students in K-2 are performing significantly below district and state expectations. It is critical to ensure students receive the foundations necessary to be successful in the older grades.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, 70% of students will demonstrate their typical growth on the spring iReady diagnostic.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Literacy First and the iReady diagnostic will help monitor the progress in ELA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Visibility in classrooms increases academic achievement through the use of targeted support via the administrative staff and instructional coaches. Teachers will participate in PD focused on the BEST Standards.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	My visibility shows students and staff that learning and growth is most important. The administrator also takes on the role of cheerleader in constantly celebrating the successes of students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our students with disabilities are underperforming the state average.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Students with disabilities will increase their proficiency by 8% in ELA and math this school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Inclusion teachers will track the progress of their students.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jennifer McCluskey (jennifer.mccluskey@okee.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Data tracking and regular data chats will empower the students to improve academically.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The inclusion teachers will track their students' mastery of standards using data binders and data chat techniques.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teacher will hold bi-monthly data chats.

**Person Responsible** Dana Tedders (dana.tedders@okee.k12.fl.us)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our African American population are underperforming the state average.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	African American students will increase their proficiency by 8% in ELA and math this school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The reading coach will track the progress of their students.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Data tracking and regular data chats will empower the students to improve academically.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The reading coach will track their students' mastery of standards using data binders and data chat techniques.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teacher will hold bi-monthly data chats.

**Person Responsible** Dana Tedders (dana.tedders@okee.k12.fl.us)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our African American population are underperforming the state average.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	African American students will increase their proficiency by 8% in ELA and math this school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The reading coach will track the progress of their students.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Data tracking and regular data chats will empower the students to improve academically.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The reading coach will track their students' mastery of standards using data binders and data chat techniques.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teacher will hold bi-monthly data chats.

**Person Responsible** Dana Tedders (dana.tedders@okee.k12.fl.us)

**#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** 50% or more students scored below a level 3 on the FSA.

**Measurable Outcome:** Less than 50% of students will score below a level 3 on the FSA.

**Monitoring:** Administration and the reading coach will progress monitor using iReady and standards masteries to determine if students are on track to meet this outcome.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers and students will participate in standards-based data tracking and conferencing. Additionally, teachers will implement AVID's WICOR strategies when instructing ELA.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students are underachieving by scoring a level one or two. These strategies were selected to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency on FSA. Data tracking and conferencing will provide the teacher and students the opportunity to monitor their progress and set goals regularly. WICOR strategies will increase collaboration and rigorous instruction delivered by the teachers.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Progress monitor iReady and standards masteries.

**Person Responsible** Emily Streelman (emily.streelman@okee.k12.fl.us)

**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.

**We reported 0.2 incidents per 100 students. We will continue to monitor this with a goal of 0.16 incidents per 100 students this year.**

### 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.

The school implements PBIS in all grade levels with fidelity. The school creates meaningful parent involvement. Consistent discipline is enforced throughout the school. Good behavior and achievements are celebrated.

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

The principal and assistant principal monitor the fidelity of PBIS and attend regular PBIS meetings. The parent involvement team consists of parents and staff members that work together to create meaningful events for families. The assistant principal works with the leadership team to ensure consistent discipline is enforced throughout the school. Teachers celebrate good behavior and achievements regularly with students.

### Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00