Seminole Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Seminole Elementary School

2690 NW 42ND AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://seminoleelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: Robyn Ziolkowski

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

2019-20 Status (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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
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. 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.

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

Seminole Elementary School

2690 NW 42ND AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://seminoleelementaryschool.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 KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

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.

Seminole Elementary seeks to provide a high-quality education to a diverse community of learners in a safe, respectful environment where all achieve personal and academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All members of our school community are expected to be ready, respectful and responsible in all we do.

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
Ziolkowski, Robyn	Principal	
VanderMolen, Sonya	Assistant Principal	
Altman, Sandra	Instructional Coach	
Hubbard, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Peaden, Cassie	Teacher, K-12	
Gaucin, Pamela	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/2/2021, Robyn Ziolkowski

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
33

Total number of students enrolled at the school
449

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	78	85	66	63	85	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	27	17	21	12	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	4	1	0	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	6	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	3	2	0	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	8	4	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/15/2021

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	73	78	63	60	86	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	423
Attendance below 90 percent	8	19	18	6	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	12	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	2	14	10	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	4	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	13	4	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	73	78	63	60	86	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	423
Attendance below 90 percent	8	19	18	6	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	12	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	2	14	10	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	4	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	13	4	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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				47%	52%	57%	41%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	54%	58%	43%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	55%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	62%	63%	58%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	62%	49%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	42%	51%	42%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	44%	53%	41%	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	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	46%	-4%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	66%	5%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	56%	10%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading and Math administered in the fall (baseline), winter, and spring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	40	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	40	58
	Students With Disabilities	29	17	33
	English Language Learners	6	32	47
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	18	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	18	56
	Students With Disabilities	43	0	50
	English Language Learners	11	11	53

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8	44	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	44	62
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	36
	English Language Learners	11	39	56
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	29	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	29	58
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	36
	English Language Learners	11	33	56

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	71	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	71	74
	Students With Disabilities	18	27	25
	English Language Learners	53	63	68
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10	33	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	33	70
	Students With Disabilities	9	9	25
	English Language Learners	5	32	74

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	49	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	49	60
	Students With Disabilities	0	11	10
	English Language Learners	10	29	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	36	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	36	67
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	30
	English Language Learners	10	24	57

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	28	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	28	44
	Students With Disabilities	08	0	23
	English Language Learners	6	11	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	37	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	37	55
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	6	11	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0		0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		0
	Students With Disabilities	0		0
	English Language Learners	0		0

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	24	27		24	13						
ELL	48	38		57	38		46				
HSP	51	46	36	60	47		47				
MUL	82			64							
WHT	58	53		58	33		38				
FRL	52	40	21	55	40	14	39				

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	32	35	38	43	51	55	28				
ELL	44	41	39	64	62	43	55				
BLK	20			50							
HSP	46	43	39	66	62	48	55				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	52	46	41	59	51	39	54				
FRL	43	41	41	60	59	49	55				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	27	29	29	32	36	23				
ELL	37	40	50	58	46	50	23				
BLK	31	27		47	45						
HSP	39	46	48	58	48	46	36				
WHT	46	44	53	60	49	42	53				
FRL	40	43	43	58	48	43	40				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	43
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	
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	46
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	73
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	48
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	37
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?

ELA achievement improved on the state assessment. This improvement was also demonstrated on progress monitoring for each grade level. Although overall ELA performance is improving, 50% of the students in the 5th grade scored below a level 3 on the state assessment (2020). This is 4% below the state. School state assessment data and progress monitoring indicate students in the bottom quartile are not making adequate learning gains in ELA.

Math declined in both achievement and learning gains. Specifically, 2020 math achievement shows a decrease from 63% to 55% (-8%). In addition, learning gains show a significant decrease from 59% to 44% (-15), and for those in the bottom quartile, a decline was noted from 48% to 13% (-35). Progress monitoring indicated the 5th grade had the lowest proficiency across all grade levels.

African American/Black students demonstrated the lowest subgroup performance on the FSA in both ELA and Math achievement in 2019. According to progress monitoring data, subgroup performance was also noted to be significantly lower for students with disabilities and ELLs when compared to the grade levels.

Attendance below 90% also increased over the 2020 school year from 10% to 25%.

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

Students in the bottom quartile made the least progress on FSA ELA and Math. This was noted on both the FSA and on the progress monitoring data across subgroups. African American/Black students in 2019 demonstrated the lowest subgroup performance on the FSA in both ELA and Math achievement.

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

Contributing factors to the need for improvement include poor attendance, decreased student engagement in active learning, a lack of strategic, differentiated instruction, poor teacher-student relationships, inconsistent supports for age-appropriate student development, a lack of clear, consistently high expectations, inconsistent classroom management practices, and poor attendance.

We need to improve teacher's skills and knowledge in differentiated instruction that targets students' needs, improve fidelity of the MTSS/intervention process, improve classroom management skills for new and developing teachers, increase effective, research-based visible learning strategies and active engagement.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement in 2019 (+14%) based on the 2019 state assessment. However, ELA progress monitoring also indicated steady progress and improvement in ELA.

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

Science: Implementation of new core and supplemental science curriculum, increased opportunities for hands-on science activities (STEM lab time, STEM lessons during Specials, Science Olympiad/ Science Club after school) and progress monitoring of standards mastery utilizing Study Island.

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

Utilize teacher clarity when planning learning goals and success criteria. Implementation of formative assessment and consistent practice across grade levels, increased opportunities for progress monitoring using MTSS/Branching Minds.

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.

Professional development will target data analysis, effective implementation of core and supplemental curriculum, the development of success criteria that offers multiple means of representing learning, utilizing differentiated instruction and increasing student engagement.

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

Teachers will intentionally plan to differentiate instruction (i.e., extending opportunities to learn for students who get it and support learners who are struggling). These instructional processes will be reflected in lesson plans. Use of the Branching Minds platform with fidelity to support struggling learners with targeted interventions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although ELA performance is improving, 50% of students in the 5th grade scored below level 3 in the 2020-2021 school year, which is also 4% below the state ELA average. School state assessment data and progress monitoring indicate students in the bottom quartile are not making adequate learning gains in ELA as reflected by decreases in ELA Learning Gains for bottom quartile students (-15%).
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, 5th grade students will increase ELA proficiency from 50% to 54%. By the end of 2021-2022, 45% of students in the bottom quartile will make learning gains in ELA.
Monitoring:	Lesson plans will reflect plans for ELA interventions. Interventions will be developed and monitored on Branching Minds for students who are not making adequate grade-level progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in professional development throughout the 2021-2022 school year, focusing on high-impact instructional planning. Topics include B.E.S.T instructional planning for ELA, high impact instructional strategies, developing assessments to evaluate the impact of the instruction on student learning, and MTSS/ELA intervention development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing teachers with professional development on high impact ELA instructional strategies, our instructional planning and delivery will effectively support high achievement for all learners. Research indicates the MTSS process focuses on core instruction, differentiated learning, student-centered learning, individualized student needs, and the alignment of systems necessary for all students' academic success. Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning - John Hattie, Ph,D Selecting and Implementing Evidence-Based Reading Interventions - Carolyn Denton, Ph.D.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development, collaborative planning and PLCs will target data analysis, effective implementation of core and supplemental curriculum, differentiated instruction and student engagement. Teachers will develop purposeful lesson plans with clear learning intentions and student-friendly success criteria that follow the district ELA curriculum maps and SEM block structure with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

Grade level teams will plan for differentiated instruction (What will we do if they have not learned it?), extension (What will we do if they already have learned it?), and interventions (MTSS/Branching Minds) to be implemented during K-2 and 3-5 ELA, SELA, and Remediation instructional blocks.

Person Responsible	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA Federal Index has identified our Black/African American subgroup performance at 35% which is six percent below the Federal Index.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve the ELA and math proficiency of Black/African American students in grades 3-5 from 35% to 45% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	The administration will monitor the mentor-mentee program. The administration will conduct PD for culturally responsive instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide staff with training on culturally responsive instruction. Implement the student mentor-mentee program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates when teachers address their stereotypes and choose to form positive relationships with Black students, by understanding and respecting their culture, and use effective teaching strategies, they can reach Black students. Teachers who truly want to work effectively with Black students must (1) adopt the mindset that they can help these students become better readers, (2) adopt the mindset that it is their professional responsibility to do their best to bring all students as close to grade-level standards as possible, (3) form alliances with parents, and (4) use effective and culturally relevant teaching strategies. (Harlin & Souto-Manning, 2009; Hersi & Watkinson, 2012; Nieto, Bode, Kang, & Raible, 2008; Santamaria, 2009) Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain - Zaretta Hammond, PhD

Action Steps to Implement

1. Each Black/African American student will be assigned an adult mentor to support and progress monitor student achievement, attendance and social/emotional learning.

Person Responsible	Sonya VanderMolen (sonya.vandermolen@okee.k12.fl.us)

2. Implement strategic parent outreach to motivate parents of Black/African American students to attend SAC, APTT, parent conferences and schoolwide family engagement activities.

Person Responsible	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

3. Provide staff with professional development that focuses on culturally responsive teaching strategies

Person Responsible	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math declined in both achievement and learning gains. Specifically, 2020 math achievement shows a decrease from 63% to 55% (-8%). In addition, learning gains show a decrease from 59% to 44% (-15), and for those in the bottom quartile, a significant decline was noted from 48% to 13% (-35). Progress monitoring indicated the 5th grade had the lowest proficiency across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase math achievement in grades 3-5 from 55% to 60% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year. Third grade will increase proficiency to 71%, 4th grade will improve by 10%, and 5th grade will increase by 17%. Math learning gains will increase for all students from 44% to 54% and for students in the bottom quartile from 13% to 35% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring through formative and summative assessments and the MTSS process for students who are struggling. (Branching Minds) will monitor progress and outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in professional development throughout the 2021-2022 school year, focusing on high-impact instructional planning. Topics include B.E.S.T instructional planning for math, high-impact instructional strategies, developing assessments to evaluate the impact of the instruction on student learning, and MTSS/Math intervention development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The research below identifies the use of the MTSS process to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction that addresses the development of student understanding of mathematical ideas and concepts (i.e., systematic instruction, mathematical language, mathematical representations, number lines, word problems), provides extended opportunities to practice with feedback; gives students opportunities to apply skills and strategies with teacher feedback and utilizes progress monitoring data to provide targeted instruction. Selecting and Implementing Evidence-Based Reading Interventions - Carolyn Denton, Ph.D. Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades - WWC Institute of Educational Science What Works in Math - WWC Institute of Educational Science

Action Steps to Implement	

1. Professional development, collaborative planning and PLCs will target data analysis, effective implementation of core and supplemental curriculum, differentiated instruction and increased student engagement.

Person Responsible	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

2. Strategically structure math instructional blocks to ensure data-driven whole group, small group and individual instruction.

Person Responsible	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)

#4. Other specifically relating to Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2020, the district identified 25% of our student population to have 21 or more days absent.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the percent of students with 21+ absences from 25% of the student population to 5% of the student population by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	Monitored through truancy procedures and attendance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Relationship building and engagement activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research suggests the following for reducing absenteeism: 1) Establish Positive, Supportive and Engaging School Climate, 2) Establish Positive Relationships with Students and Families, 3) Clarify Attendance Expectations and Goals, 4) Educate and Engage Students and Families About the Impact of Attendance on Achievement, and 5) Recognize Good and Improved Attendance What Works Clearinghouse

Action Steps to Implement

1. Incentivize improved and perfect student attendance through PBIS activities and awards programs.

Person Responsible	Sonya VanderMolen (sonya.vandermolen@okee.k12.fl.us)

2. Implement supplemental instructional programs such as social emotional learning to address students' attitudes toward school, learning and self-esteem.

Person Responsible	Sonya VanderMolen (sonya.vandermolen@okee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Seminole Elementary School reported one harassment incident and one physical attack incident out of 509 students. This resulted in a rate of 0.4 incidents per 100 students which is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students which was lower than the state at 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Seminole Elementary also reported 21 suspensions. This resulted in a rating of 4.1 suspensions per 100 students.

The leadership team and PBIS/problem solving (MTSS) team closely monitor discipline events to ensure equity and supportive practices are in place for students demonstrating behavioral difficulties throughout the year. Teams will analyze discipline data weekly to determine if significant increases or decreases in student discipline offenses were observed. Behavior issues (except for general bus referrals) will be discussed, and the teams will implement preventative supports for students who demonstrate more than one discipline offense. If a question about equity is evident, the team will address the issue, evaluate the current practices in place, and communicate clear expectations for change if needed.

In addition to the team meetings, the school administration will utilize the weekly newsletter to provide teachers with weekly data regarding the type of discipline offenses occurring on campus. Weekly comparisons will be made regarding increases or decreases in student behaviors and offense type. Data comparing discipline offenses at different time points will be posted in the weekly school faculty newsletter.

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.

A school-wide PBIS framework designed to improve behavioral and academic outcomes will be utilized. Teachers have been trained to differentiate between minor and major problem behaviors and work on a Tier 1 level with minor behaviors. Grade-level teacher teams will collaborate and develop strong team PBIS discipline plans that include elements of Restorative Practice. These plans will clearly outline PBIS reward implementation, including the school-wide Scholar Dollar reward system and grade-level award assemblies.

In addition to improving school climate and preventing problem behaviors, the school-wide PBIS framework was designed to promote increased learning time and positive social skills support through the Seminole 3

R's. Be Ready (e.g., I prepare for class every day), Be Responsible (e.g., I will walk quietly on the right-hand side of the sidewalk), and Be Respectful (e.g., I will not talk when others are talking) is posted in all hallways, common areas, and in every classroom. The meaning behind each of the expectations is explicitly taught and reinforced through the grade level discipline plans.

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

Research shows that students receive the following benefits from a collaborative partnership with the school, the family and the community: higher grades and test scores, better attendance and homework completion, fewer placements in special education, more positive attitudes and behavior, higher graduation rates and greater enrollment in post-secondary education. The gain for families includes improved understanding of their child's development, improved ability to parent, improved ability to assist their children with school and learning, and improved relationships among all stakeholders. Parents are invited to attend APTT to connect with their students' teacher and to engage in daily communication with their teachers through our online communication tool.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00