Okeechobee County School District

Everglades Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Everglades Elementary School

3725 SE 8TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://evergladeselementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: Christina Norman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2019

| 2019-20 Status | Active |
|---|---|
| (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| 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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Infe | ormation* |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F | or 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.

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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Everglades Elementary School

3725 SE 8TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://evergladeselementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

School Demographics

| School Type and Gr (per MSID I | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Elementary S KG-5 | school | Yes | | 100% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 49% |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | С | С | С |

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.

Everglades Elementary School strives to instill in students a desire for academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everglades Elementary School believes all children have the ability to reach their full potential through collaborative efforts of the faculty, staff, parents, community and students. Everglades will cultivate an appreciation and respect for lifelong learning.

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 |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Ellis, Jennifer | Principal | Mrs. Ellis is the instructional leader of Everglades Elementary School. She provides leadership that allows teachers to grow professionally through a combination of frequent coaching and feedback sessions, facilitating the PLC process, and ensuring all instructional staff have access to research based professional learning opportunities on a regular basis. Mrs. Ellis works collaboratively with teachers, staff, parents, and community members to assess the needs of the school and to implement school improvement initiatives. Mrs. Ellis is committed to academic excellence and believes all students can achieve. |
| Worf, Mike | Assistant Principal | Mr. Worf supports the MTSS team as they dissagregate student data, Mr. Worf works with teachers to support classroom management and best instructional practices. Mr. Worf supports school site mental health and social emotional initiatives. |
| Stanley, Lara | Instructional Coach | Ms. Stanley is an instructional leader at Everglades Elementary School. Ms. Stanley works with instructional staff daily to improve instructional practices through the coaching cycle. Ms. Stanley works with teachers weekly during PLCs to review data and to plan for standards based instruction and assessment. |
| Stinnett, Melanie | School Counselor | Mrs. Stinnett facilitates the school wide MTSS process. She regularly works with teachers to improve their instructional practices through the intervention process. Mrs. Stinnett is the school site PBIS coach and works with all stakeholders to ensure PBIS is implemented with fidelity. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/23/2019, Christina Norman

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.

4

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.

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

659

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | |
|--|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 99 | 99 | 111 | 126 | 100 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 643 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 7 | 12 | 17 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 5 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gra | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOTAL |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 8 | 8 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | |
| 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

Friday 8/13/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 69 | 78 | 110 | 90 | 98 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 535 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 6 | 31 | 11 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | 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 | | | | | | Gra | ide | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 69 | 78 | 110 | 90 | 98 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 535 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 6 | 31 | 11 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | 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 | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| lu dia sta u | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 54% | 52% | 57% | 42% | 47% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 64% | 54% | 58% | 52% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 55% | 53% | 50% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 58% | 62% | 63% | 49% | 59% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 57% | 62% | 53% | 54% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35% | 42% | 51% | 45% | 41% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 41% | 44% | 53% | 47% | 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 | 57% | 59% | -2% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 46% | 5% | 58% | -7% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 50% | 1% | 56% | -5% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -51% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 66% | -4% | 62% | 0% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 64% | -7% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -62% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 56% | -5% | 60% | -9% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -57% | | | • | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 44% | -5% | 53% | -14% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

1st Grade: iReady for ELA & Math 2nd Grade: iReady for ELA & Math 3rd Grade: iReady for ELA & Math 4th Grade: iReady for ELA & Math

5th Grade: iReady for ELA & Math and Science Benchmark Assessment

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10 | 59 | 86 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 | 59 | 86 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13 | 50 | 89 |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 54 | 79 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 2 | 48 | 71 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 2 | 48 | 71 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 20 | 56 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 17 | 50 |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 33 | Spring 56 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 8 | 33 | 56 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With | Fall 8 8 | 33 33 | 56 56 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 8 8 0 | 33 33 22 | 56 56 30 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 8 8 0 0 | 33 33 22 12 | 56 56 30 50 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 8 8 0 0 Fall | 33 33 22 12 Winter | 56 56 30 50 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 8 8 0 0 Fall 2 | 33 33 22 12 Winter 22 | 56 56 30 50 Spring 55 |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20 | 37 | 57 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 20 | 37 | 57 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 18 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 16 | 32 | 51 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 4 | 24 | 46 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 4 | 24 | 46 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 18 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 19 | 35 |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 4 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 61 | Spring 65 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 25 | 61 | 65 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 25 25 | 61 61 | 65 65 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | Fall 25 25 5 16 Fall | 61 61 42 48 Winter | 65 65 44 55 Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 25 25 5 16 | 61 61 42 48 | 65 65 44 55 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 25 25 5 16 Fall | 61 61 42 48 Winter | 65 65 44 55 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 25 25 5 16 Fall 6 | 61 61 42 48 Winter 22 | 65 65 44 55 Spring 56 |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 21 | 39 | 45 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 21 | 39 | 45 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 32 | 29 |
| | English Language Learners | 6 | 13 | 33 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10 | 37 | 61 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 | 37 | 61 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 20 | 43 |
| | English Language Learners | 11 | 13 | 67 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 40 | 50 | |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 40 | 50 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 35 | 46 | |
| | English Language Learners | 31 | 42 | |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 27 | 38 | 47 | 37 | 44 | 50 | 12 | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 51 | 45 | 51 | 59 | 36 | 39 | | | | |
| BLK | 56 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 52 | 58 | 50 | 59 | 42 | 40 | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 57 | | 60 | 61 | | 57 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 64 | 53 | 53 | 60 | 31 | 52 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 22 | 42 | 44 | 31 | 45 | 34 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 57 | 50 | 51 | 60 | 21 | 30 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 50 | | 44 | 60 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 61 | 45 | 53 | 63 | 23 | 27 | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| MUL | 53 | 55 | | 47 | 45 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 68 | 61 | 64 | 63 | 45 | 54 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 60 | 52 | 56 | 58 | 35 | 39 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 20 | 39 | 42 | 35 | 51 | 36 | 32 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 48 | 57 | 43 | 41 | 42 | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 40 | | 31 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 47 | 52 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 41 | | | | |
| HOF | 00 | ''' | 02 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | .,, | 02 | 47 | | | | | | | |
| | | 56 | 53 | | 52 | 35 | 51 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| 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 | 54 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 56 | | | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 435 | | | | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 | | | | | | |
| Percent Tested | 100% | | | | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | | | | | |

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

| English Language Learners | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 48 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | <u>.</u> | | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 45 | | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | |
| Hispanic Students | | | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 50 | | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | |
| Multiracial Students | | | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | | | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | |
| | | | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | | | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | | |
| | N/A | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | N/A 58 | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students | 58 | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 58 | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 58 | | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% Economically Disadvantaged Students | 58 NO | | |

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?

ELA learning gains and achievement and Math learning gains and achievement have declined across multiple grade levels.

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

ELA learning gains and ELA achievement have been identified as an area in need of improvement. Based on 2021 FSA ELA data, only 54% of students made learning gains in ELA, only 43% of 3rd graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA ELA, and only 49% of 4th graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA ELA. This data reflects a 10% drop in ELA learning gains when compared to 2019 FSA ELA data. Based on 2021 iReady Reading data, only 64% of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade reached their Annual Typical Growth on the end of the year iReady Reading Diagnostic Assessment.

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

With the educational impact and learning loss of COVID-19, there is an increased need for research based, targeted small group instruction to meet the varying needs of students.

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

Bottom quartile math learning gains showed the most improvement based on 2021 data.

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

During the 2020-2021 school year, ESE support staff provided small group math interventions to ESE and tier 3 math students.

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

Student learning will improve in foundational reading skills as teachers engage in Literacy First and ECRI professional learning/coaching and feedback and implement that learning in the classroom.

Student learning will improve as a Multi-Tiered System of Support is put into action during grade level intervention/enrichment blocks.

Student learning will improve as professional learning communities collaborate, learn, plan, and achieve results.

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 in K-5th grade will participate in regular professional learning sessions with our Literacy First and ECRI consultant.

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

- #1: MTSS Student learning will improve as a Multi-Tiered System of Support is put into action during grade level intervention/enrichment blocks.
- #2: PLCs Student learning will improve as professional learning communities collaborate, learn, plan, and achieve results.
- # 3: ECRI Student learning will improve in foundational reading skills as teachers engage in professional learning/coaching and feedback and implement that learning in the classroom.
- # 4: Literacy First Student learning will improve in reading and math as teachers implement anatomy of a lesson, the gradual release model, and academic learning time in core subject areas. Teachers will periodically engage in refresher Literacy First professional learning throughout the school year and implement that learning in the classroom.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

ELA learning gains and ELA achievement have been identified as an area in need of improvement. Based on 2021 FSA ELA data, only 54% of students made learning gains in ELA, only 43% of 3rd graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA ELA, and only 49% of 4th graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA ELA. This data reflects a 10% drop in ELA learning gains when compared to 2019 FSA ELA data. Based on 2021 iReady Reading data, only 64% of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade reached their Annual Typical Growth on the end of the year iReady Reading Diagnostic Assessment.

Area of Focus **Description** and Rationale:

Classroom observation data from the 2020-2021 school year indicated that 78% of teachers are providing targeted small group instruction during intervention/enrichment time.

With the educational impact and learning loss of COVID-19, there is an increased need for research based, targeted small group instruction to meet the varying needs of students. Student learning will improve as a Multi-Tiered System of Support is put into action during grade level intervention/enrichment time.

Everglades Elementary Schools focus aligns to the Okeechobee County School District's Strategic Plan Goal 1, Strategy C to Strengthen the MTSS Process.

Measurable Outcome:

100% of students in 3rd through 5th grade will achieve ELA learning gains on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA assessment. 100% of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade will reach their Annual Typical Growth on the end of year iReady Reading Diagnostic Assessment. 100% of teachers will utilize the intervention/enrichment block within their daily schedule to provide targeted small group instruction to meet the individualized learning needs of students.

Monitoring:

During regular bi-weekly meetings with the school based leadership team, school wide iReady, Standards Mastery, and MTSS data will be dissagregated and shared to monitor progress towards our goals. Frequent classroom walk-throughs and observations will be conducted by school administrators to ensure all teachers implement targeted small group instruction during the intervention/enrichment block.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

All K-5 teachers will participate in Literacy First and ECRI professional learning sessions throughout the 21-22 school year. This professional learning will specifically focus on implementing research based strategies such as: targeted small group instruction to meet the needs of students, gradual release model, anatomy of a lesson, academic learning time, and PA/PH instruction.

Evidencebased Strategy:

All K-5 teachers will participate in regular PLCs to collaborate, learn, plan, and achieve

results.

All K-5 teachers will implement a Multi-Tiered System of Support during grade level ELA intervention/enrichment blocks.

Rationale for Evidence-

By providing teachers with professional learning opportunities and resources, classroom instruction will be effectively supported to ensure student learning and achievement.

based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS - Student learning will improve as a Multi-Tiered System of Support is put into action during grade level intervention/enrichment blocks. Instructional staff will plan with grade level teams during PLCs for differentiated instruction. Instructional staff will engage in the PLC process to ensure all students receive differentiated instruction in the core subject areas. Instructional staff will frequently review classroom data to monitor the progress of students and update Branching Minds frequently.

Person Responsible Mike Worf (james.worf@okee.k12.fl.us)

PLCs - Student learning will improve as professional learning communities collaborate, learn, plan, and achieve results. Instructional staff will engage in the PLC process to ensure all students receive quality instruction in the core subject areas. Instructional staff will frequently review classroom data to monitor the progress of my students. Instructional staff will come prepared to PLCs with current classroom data, relevant instructional materials, and ideas to share for best practices for instruction.

Person Responsible Lara Stanley (lara.stanley@okee.k12.fl.us)

ECRI - Student learning will improve in foundational reading skills as teachers engage in ECRI professional learning/coaching and feedback and implement that learning in the classroom. Instructional staff will attend professional learning sessions and engage in the PLC process so that they can effectively implement ECRI's instructional routines in the classroom.

Person Responsible Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

Literacy First - Student learning will improve in reading as teachers implement anatomy of a lesson, the gradual release model, and academic learning time in core subject areas. Teachers will periodically engage in refresher Literacy First professional learning throughout the school year and implement that learning in the classroom. Instructional staff will attend professional learning sessions and engage in the PLC process so they can effectively employ the Gradual Release Model, Anatomy of a Lesson, and Academic Learning Time.

Person
Responsible
Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Math learning gains and Math achievement have been identified as an area in need of improvement. Based on 2021 FSA Math data, only 60% of students made learning gains in Math, only 48% of 3rd graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA Math, only 55% of 4th graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA Math, and only 52% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA Math. Based on 2021 iReady Math data, only 72% of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade reached their Annual Typical Growth on the end of the year iReady Math Diagnostic Assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Classroom observation data from the 2020-2021 school year indicated that 78% of teachers are providing targeted small group instruction during intervention/enrichment time.

With the educational impact and learning loss of COVID-19, there is an increased need for research based, targeted small group instruction to meet the varying needs of students. Student learning will improve as a Multi-Tiered System of Support is put into action during grade level intervention/enrichment time.

Everglades Elementary Schools focus aligns to the Okeechobee County School District's Strategic Plan Goal 1, Strategy C to Strengthen the MTSS Process.

Measurable Outcome:

100% of students in 3rd through 5th grade will achieve Math learning gains on the 2021-2022 FSA Math assessment. 100% of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade will reach their Annual Typical Growth on the end of year iReady Math Diagnostic Assessment. 100% of teachers will utilize the intervention/enrichment block within their daily schedule to provide targeted small group instruction to meet the individualized learning needs of students.

Monitoring:

During regular bi-weekly meetings with the school based leadership team, school wide iReady, Standards Mastery, and MTSS data will be disaggregated and shared to monitor progress towards our goals. Frequent classroom walk-throughs and observations will be conducted by school administrators to ensure all teachers implement targeted small group instruction during grade level intervention/enrichment blocks.

Person responsible for

Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

for monitoring outcome:

All K-5 teachers will participate in professional learning sessions throughout the 21-22 school year. This professional learning will specifically focus on implementing targeted small group instruction to meet the needs of students.

Evidencebased Strategy:

All K-5 teachers will participate in regular PLCs to collaborate, learn, plan, and achieve results.

All K-5 teachers will implement a Multi-Tiered System of Support during grade level Math intervention/enrichment blocks.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

By providing teachers with professional learning opportunities and resources, classroom instruction will be effectively supported to ensure student learning and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS - Student learning will improve as a Multi-Tiered System of Support is put into action during grade level intervention/enrichment blocks. Instructional staff will plan with grade level teams during PLCs for differentiated instruction. Instructional staff will engage in the PLC process to ensure all students receive differentiated instruction in the core subject areas. Instructional staff will frequently review classroom data to monitor the progress of students and update Branching Minds frequently.

Person Responsible Mike Worf (james.worf@okee.k12.fl.us)

PLCs - Student learning will improve as professional learning communities collaborate, learn, plan, and achieve results. Instructional staff will engage in the PLC process to ensure all students receive quality instruction in the core subject areas. Instructional staff will frequently review classroom data to monitor the progress of my students. Instructional staff will come prepared to PLCs with current classroom data, relevant instructional materials, and ideas to share for best practices for instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning- Student learning will improve in math as teachers implement anatomy of a lesson, the gradual release model, and academic learning time in core subject areas. Teachers will periodically engage in refresher Literacy First professional learning throughout the school year and implement that learning in the classroom. Instructional staff will attend professional learning sessions and engage in the PLC process so they can effectively employ the Gradual Release Model, Anatomy of a Lesson, and Academic Learning Time.

Person Responsible Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and

To increase student achievement through rigorous, standards based instruction in ELA, Math, and Science for Students with Disabilities. To increase student achievement through rigorous, standards based instruction in ELA, Math, and Science for Students with Disabilities.

Rationale:

Measurable

For the 21-22 school year, students with disabilities will earn 45% or more of the points on

Outcome: the

the federal index.

During regular bi-weekly meetings with the school based leadership team, school wide iReady, Standards Mastery, and MTSS data will be disaggregated and shared to monitor progress towards our goals. Frequent classroom walk-throughs and observations will be conducted by school administrators to ensure all ESE teachers implement targeted small

group instruction.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based
All ESE inclusion teachers will provide support for ESE students in the full time classrooms.
All ESE students will be invited to participate in after school tutorial for remedial instruction in ELA, Math, and Science. All ESE teachers will participate in regular professional learning

Strategy:

with our Literacy First consultant and actively participate in grade level PLCs.

Rationale

By providing ESE teachers with instructional professional development and resources,

for Evidence-

classroom instruction will be effectively supported to ensure student learning.

based Strategy:

By providing ESE students with tutorial services, student achievement will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

During PLCs in the 21-22 school year, the administrative team will meet with ESE teachers to write ELA and math remedial lesson plans. ESE teachers will participate in regular professional learning sessions with our Literacy First consultant.

Person

Responsible Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

The Bottom Quartile, including ESE students, will be identified and provided with additional remedial instruction. Administration will ensure that all ESE students are invited to attend after school tutorial for remedial instruction.

Person

Responsible Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

The administrative team will conduct regular classroom walk-throughs in ESE classrooms during ELA and math instruction to ensure successful implementation of the evidence-based strategies and to identify any areas in need of improvement.

Person

Jennifer Ellis (jennifer.ellis@okee.k12.fl.us)

Responsible

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Everglades Elementary School had a "high" number of out-of-school suspensions in the 2019-2020 school year. In an effort to reduce the number of out-of-school suspensions in the current school year, Everglades has implemented social emotional learning lessons in all classrooms. In addition, all MTSS-B students are assigned an adult mentor. Our on campus, Tykes and Teens counselor works with many students utilizing SEL curriculum and lessons in both individual and group settings. Everglades Elementary School is a PBIS school and has earned the 2020-2021 Resilient FLPBIS Model School award.

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.

All students at Everglades Elementary School participate in social emotional learning. Students engage in social emotional learning in the classroom setting and in special area classes. Everglades is a PBIS school and has an active PBIS committee who works diligently to promote positive behavior and a positive environment on our campus. Students are recognized daily for positive behavior and have the opportunity to engage in frequent events and activities for positive behavior. Positive lessons and messages are shared daily on the morning announcements by Mrs. Ellis, principal. Everglades Elementary has a Crime Watch and Safety Patrol team led by 5th grade students who meet regularly with school leaders to ensure there is a positive and safe environment on our campus. Throughout the school year, there are several school-wide events that our school engages in to promote a positive school culture and environment such as: Start With Hello Week, Bullying Prevention Month, Monthly PBIS events, Kindness Week, and Red Ribbon Week.

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

Mrs. Jenni Ellis, Principal Mr. Mike Worf, Assistant Principal Mrs. Melanie Stinnett, Guidance Counselor Deputy Higgins, SRO

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 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |