

Okeechobee County School District

Central 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	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Central Elementary School

610 SW 5TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

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

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Kubit

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%)
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

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	27

Central Elementary School

610 SW 5TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

<http://centralelementaryschool.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	62%

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.

We are committed to creating successful life-long learners in a diverse learning environment by building a strong foundation in student achievement through rigorous data driven instruction, character education, social emotional well-being, and a rich culture of reading.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to continue the pledge of putting students first and we continue to commit to build a strong culture of successful life-long learners, through the building of strong relationships. We will focus on safety, student achievement through rigorous and data driven instruction, character education, social-emotional well-being, and building a culture of reading in a diversity rich learning environment. We believe that all students are empowered to achieve success when immersed in a powerful learning community that values a diverse student body and is centered on core values as well as a shared commitment to achieving academic excellence.

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
Kubit, Cynthia	Principal	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings, and other school-wide improvement meetings, initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Torres, Christie	Assistant Principal	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings, and other school-wide improvement meetings, initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Syples, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings, and other school-wide improvement meetings, initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Davis, Morgan	School Counselor	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings, and other school-wide improvement meetings, initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Cynthia Kubit

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

513

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

5

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	94	73	100	85	78	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
Attendance below 90 percent	33	24	41	28	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	32	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	32	39	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	35	10	14	10	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	35	10	14	10	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	5	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	1	17	3	21	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	1	15	7	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	10	0	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	5	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	1	17	3	21	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	1	15	7	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	10	0	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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				46%	52%	57%	44%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	54%	58%	48%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	55%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	62%	63%	59%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				42%	57%	62%	54%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	42%	51%	33%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	44%	53%	55%	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	42%	50%	-8%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	66%	0%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	56%	-11%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	44%	-8%	53%	-17%
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 Assessment and Performance Matters for Science were used to progress monitor by grade level.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/7%	24/26%	42/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/11%	2/22%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	4/22%	4/21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/6%	12/13%	37/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11%	1/11%	1/11%
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/9%	21/23%	38/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	1/5%	2/10%
	English Language Learners	1/4%	1/4%	6/24%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/2%	6/6%	22/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	0/0%	3/15%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/10%	13/16%	22/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	2/14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/2%	3/3%	15/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	2/13%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/9%	15/18%	17/21%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/4%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/2%	6/7%	13/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	2/8%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0%	1/8%	1/8%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/9%	9/10%	20/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/3%	1/3%	1/3%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/6%	13/14%	21/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/3%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/19%	22/24%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7/21%	3/9%	
	English Language Learners	1/20%	1/25%	

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	10	22	38	14	5		6				
ELL	29	21	18	31	21		24				
BLK	27			27							
HSP	33	24	23	34	27		28				
MUL	31			46							
WHT	49	38		45	24		41				
FRL	33	29	25	34	25		26				
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	15	47	54	43	34	40	9				
ELL	34	45	64	53	50	50	28				
BLK	43	76		34	43		18				

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
HSP	40	49	64	63	48	47	37				
MUL	58			33							
WHT	54	44		63	35	17	50				
FRL	42	51	59	60	41	39	37				
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	27	40	56	30	32	25	26				
ELL	27	49	50	45	40	33	46				
BLK	29	31		43	47						
HSP	42	52	59	60	54	30	53				
WHT	52	51	58	64	56	23	60				
FRL	40	48	53	58	52	34	53				

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	245
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	28
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	27
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	27
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	39
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	28
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?

We are scoring below the district and state in both reading, math and science. Subgroups show a significant decline in both SWD and ELL. SWD groups have dropped below 41%.

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

iReady progress monitoring data and state assessments reveal a decline in Reading and Math in 3-5, especially in ELL and SWD subgroups where students are stagnant and not improving. Science achievement in 5th grade has also significantly dropped by 23% since 2018.

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 include pervasive impacts from the pandemic. Students have not been in attendance. Many did not attend for a year or more, causing significant declines in achievement. Mass quarantines also led to missed instructional time. Educators and leaders faced having to find creative ways to continue instruction for students who were no longer attending school and many both taught in person and via a digital platform simultaneously. Mental health and behaviors became critical factors and students lost socialization skills as well. Many leaders, teachers, students, and families felt overwhelmed by the pandemic and teaching and learning suffered as a result. We also lost 3 teachers who retired early in the year due to the pandemic and these classes had long term subs.

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

No achievement area showed improvement at our school. We held our own in a few limited areas, but overall our performance declined.

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

Math is the only area where we held our score for the most part. We changed by -1 in this area. We are departmentalized in 5th grade and a highly effective teacher found a way to overcome lack of engagement and kept her students learning.

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

Accelerated learning groups will be needed to ensure that intervention is delivered consistently to increase student achievement. Implementation will require quality classroom management, effective/researched based teaching & learning strategies and increased student engagement as a primary focus. Increased progress monitoring, collaborative planning teams (CPT), strategic PLCs, data chats, teacher observations with coaching cycles, and common planning and assessments will be paramount. Leadership will also be vital in ensuring these practices take place with fidelity.

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 opportunities will be provided to support teachers and leaders. The PD will address research-based teaching and learning strategies, effective use of data and progress monitoring, CPT/PLC training, BEST training, and common planning through the use of PM data at regular intervals. Intervention training in MTSS will also be important.

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

Every effort is being made to use staff effectively to improve instruction. Training will be offered for parents and families in SAC and PTO to better assist with their child's education. Homework is strategically being geared to address fluency in ELA and Math. Reading fluency passages, vocabulary, and sight words are being used as well to address learning gaps. Students who are out on quarantine are asked to take their Chromebook home in order to keep up with their work and gain daily access to their teacher for student and family support as needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the state assessments, district progress monitoring and ESSA subgroup data for Students with Disabilities, students are scoring below the Federal threshold at 41% and below the state and district levels in both reading and math achievement, learning gains and bottom quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement, ELA learning gains, and ELA L25% need to increase for students with disabilities in 2021-2022. ELA- Achievement is at 15, LG is at 47, and L25 is at 54. The 2019 school data is at 46, 52, and 60 respectively. As a school we plan to increase our outcome for SWDs to surpass our 2019 school data in these categories for reading. Math achievement, Math learning gains, and Math L25% need to increase for students with disabilities in the 2021-2022 school year. Math -Achievement is at 43, LG is at 34, and L25 is at 40. The 2019 school data is at 58, 42, and 37 respectively. As a school we plan to increase our SWD's outcome to surpass our 2019 data in all categories. In Science for 2019, SWDs were at 9 & the school was at 37. Our goal is to surpass 37.
Monitoring:	Frequent progress monitoring through iReady, Study Island, standards masteries, and common assessments will be reviewed during Collaborative Planning Team Meetings each week to determine the progress of individual students. Students needing intervention will drive lesson development, and additional progress monitoring through re-assessment. Intervention groups will be adjusted according to needs. PLC data chats will review school-wide and grade level data to determine progress of students and training/coaching needs in problem areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and administration will utilize data chats, PLCs, CPTs, and coaching to identify current levels of achievement using previous assessment data and progress monitoring; such as iReady diagnostics, benchmark assessments data, standards mastery, and NWEA to develop strategic instructional lessons designed to close learning gaps for targeted intervention groups specifically for SWDs as well as other subgroups. PLCs and PD will be focused on effective instructional strategies; such as classroom management, engagement, rigor, questioning techniques and research based methods designed to deepen student understanding. Teachers will collaboratively plan with their team and inclusion teachers to differentiate instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to improve ELA, Math, and Science among SWD students, data chats and collaborative planning must occur frequently to progress monitor all intervention groups to access student growth and gaps. Intervention groups will increase differentiation and rigorous targeted instruction. Tutorials will target SWD and L25 students first.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers, leadership and administration will participate in weekly PLCs (& CPTs) to facilitate strategic use of core and supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction, student practice and formative/summative assessment through frequent analysis of student data.

Person Responsible Kimberly Sypley (kimberly.collier@okee.k12.fl.us)

Administration will conduct ongoing informal and formal observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and the Instructional Practice Guide.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

The instructional coach will conduct instructional coaching cycles with teachers to improve instructional outcomes.

Person Responsible Kimberly Sypley (kimberly.collier@okee.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will maintain a data binder to be utilized in PLCs and CPTs for data chats and strategic lesson planning for tier 2 and 3 students in need of differentiation. Progress monitoring will be kept in Branching Minds and MTSS meetings will be held quarterly.

Person Responsible Morgan Davis (morgan.richey@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the state assessments and district progress monitoring, students in ELA are scoring far below the state and district levels in ELA achievement, learning gains and bottom quartile. 2019 data showed ELA achievement at 46%, LG at 52%, and L25% at 60%. Though we opted out, 2021 data showed ELA achievement at 39%, LG at 31%, and L25% at 30% revealing a critical need for improvement in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Since 2019 data showed ELA achievement at 46%, LG at 52%, and L25% at 60% and 2021 ELA achievement at 39%, LG at 31%, and L25% at 30% our school plan is to increase our outcome for all students and to surpass our 2019 school data in these categories for reading.
Monitoring:	Frequent progress monitoring through iReady, standards masteries, and common assessments will be reviewed during Collaborative Planning Team Meetings (CPTs) each week to determine the progress of individual students. Students needing intervention will drive lesson development, and additional progress monitoring through re-assessment. Intervention groups will be adjusted according to needs. PLC data chats will review school-wide and grade level data to determine progress of students and training/coaching needs in problem areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and administration will utilize data chats, PLCs, CPTs, and coaching to identify current levels of achievement using previous assessment data and progress monitoring; such as iReady diagnostics, benchmark assessment data, and standards mastery to develop strategic instructional lessons designed to close learning gaps for targeted intervention groups. PLCs and PD will be focused on effective instructional strategies; such as classroom management, engagement, rigor, questioning techniques and research based methods designed to deepen student understanding. Teachers will collaboratively plan with their team and inclusion teachers to differentiate instruction during core and acceleration time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to improve ELA, data chats and collaborative planning must occur frequently to progress monitor all intervention groups to access student growth and gaps. Intervention groups will increase differentiation and rigorous targeted instruction. Tutorials will target SWD and L25 students first.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers, leadership and administration will participate in weekly PLCs (& CPTs) to facilitate strategic use of core and supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction, student practice and formative/summative assessment through frequent analysis of student data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

Administration will conduct ongoing informal and formal observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and the Instructional Practice Guide.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

The instructional coach will conduct instructional coaching cycles with teachers to improve instructional outcomes.

Person Responsible Kimberly Syples (kimberly.collier@okee.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will maintain a data to be utilized in PLCs and CPTs for data chats and strategic lesson planning for tier 2 and 3 students in need of differentiation. Progress monitoring will be kept in Branching Minds and MTSS meetings will be held quarterly.

Person Responsible Morgan Davis (morgan.richey@okee.k12.fl.us)

The leadership team will play an active role in PLCs, CPTs, and monitoring of core instruction, intervention practices, and acceleration time.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	According to the state assessments and district progress monitoring, students are scoring below below the state and district levels in math achievement, learning gains and bottom quartile.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	According to the state assessments and district progress monitoring, students in Math are scoring far below the state and district levels in ELA achievement, learning gains and bottom quartile. 2019 data showed Math achievement at 58%, LG at 42%, and L25% at 37%. Though we opted out, 2021 data showed Math achievement at 38%, LG at 25%, and L25% at 0% revealing a critical need for improvement in Math.
Monitoring:	Frequent progress monitoring through iReady, standards masteries, and common assessments will be reviewed during Collaborative Planning Team Meetings (CPTs) each week to determine the progress of individual students. Students needing intervention will drive lesson development, and additional progress monitoring through re-assessment. Intervention groups will be adjusted according to needs. PLC data chats will review school-wide and grade level data to determine progress of students and training/coaching needs in problem areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and administration will utilize data chats, PLCs, CPTs, and coaching to identify current levels of achievement using previous assessment data and progress monitoring; such as iReady diagnostics, benchmark assessment data, and standards mastery to develop strategic instructional lessons designed to close learning gaps for targeted intervention groups. PLCs and PD will be focused on effective instructional strategies; such as classroom management, engagement, rigor, questioning techniques and research based methods designed to deepen student understanding. Teachers will collaboratively plan with their team and inclusion teachers to differentiate instruction during core and acceleration time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to improve Math outcomes, data chats and collaborative planning must occur frequently to progress monitor all intervention groups to access student growth and gaps. Intervention groups will increase differentiation and rigorous targeted instruction. Tutorials will target SWD and L25 students first.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers, leadership and administration will participate in weekly PLCs (& CPTs) to facilitate strategic use of core and supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction, student practice and formative/summative assessment through frequent analysis of student data.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

Administration will conduct ongoing informal and formal observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and the Instructional Practice Guide.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

The instructional coach will conduct instructional coaching cycles with teachers to improve instructional outcomes.

Person Responsible Kimberly Sypley (kimberly.collier@okee.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will maintain a data to be utilized in PLCs and CPTs for data chats and strategic lesson planning for tier 2 and 3 students in need of differentiation. Progress monitoring will be kept in Branching Minds and MTSS meetings will be held quarterly.

Person Responsible Morgan Davis (morgan.richey@okee.k12.fl.us)

The leadership team will play an active role in PLCs, CPTs, and monitoring of core instruction, intervention practices, and acceleration time.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

According to the state assessments and district progress monitoring, students are scoring below below the state and district levels in science achievement.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

According to the state assessments and district progress monitoring, students in Science are scoring far below the state and district levels in Science. 2019 data showed achievement at 37%. Though we opted out, 2021 data showed Science achievement at 30% revealing a critical need for improvement.

Monitoring:

Frequent progress monitoring through Study Island, and common assessments will be reviewed during Collaborative Planning Team Meetings (CPTs) each week to determine the progress of individual students. Students needing intervention will drive lesson development, and additional progress monitoring through re-assessment. Intervention groups will be adjusted according to needs. PLC data chats will review school-wide and grade level data to determine progress of students and training/coaching needs in problem areas.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Teachers and administration will utilize data chats, PLCs, CPTs, and coaching to identify current levels of achievement using previous assessment data and progress monitoring; such as Study Island, benchmark assessment data, and common assessments to develop strategic instructional lessons designed to close learning gaps for targeted intervention groups. PLCs and PD will be focused on effective instructional strategies; such as classroom management, engagement, rigor, questioning techniques and research based methods designed to deepen student understanding. Teachers will collaboratively plan with their team and support staff.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

In order to improve Science outcomes, data chats and collaborative planning must occur frequently to progress monitor all intervention groups to access student growth and gaps. Intervention groups will increase differentiation and rigorous targeted instruction. Tutorials will target SWD and L25 students first.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop and ensure use of K-2 and 3-5 STEM Labs with increased use of hands on activities, problem solving activities, experiments and the use of scientific method while building student vocabulary on Study Island and Mystery Science.

**Person
Responsible**

Christie Torres (christie.torres@okee.k12.fl.us)

Administration will conduct ongoing informal and formal observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and the Instructional Practice Guide.

**Person
Responsible**

Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

Teachers, leadership and administration will participate in weekly PLCs (& CPTs) to facilitate strategic use of core and supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction, student practice and formative/summative assessment through frequent analysis of student data.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

The instructional coach will conduct instructional coaching cycles with teachers to improve instructional outcomes.

Person Responsible Kimberly Syples (kimberly.collier@okee.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will maintain a data to be utilized in PLCs and CPTs for data chats and strategic lesson planning for tier 2 and 3 students in need of differentiation.

Person Responsible Morgan Davis (morgan.richey@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.

Central Elementary School 0031 ranked #270 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. Our school ranked #2 out of 5 elementary schools in our county. Violent incidents were ranked low, property incidents were marked very low, and drug/public order incidents were also marked very low. In terms of suspensions we were ranked very low and were the lowest in our county. We will continue to monitor violent incidents. We have implemented PBIS rewards for students with no referrals as this has provided incentive to handle their problems with the use of their words versus putting hands on someone. We use progressive discipline and seek to find solutions and build positive relationships with students. We participate in helping students find their trusted adults as this strategy has proven helpful in reducing bullying incidents.

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.

We believe that positive relationships among staff, students, and families can be the foundation to building a successful school climate. We strive to create a school environment where students feel safe, supported, engaged, accepted and loved. We are a Title I school and for many students we are their safe haven. We believe a positive school culture can improve academic achievement, attendance, behavior and resilience,

especially in this unprecedented time of a pandemic. We believe a positive school culture and environment also increases teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention. Teachers actively and purposefully greet their students as they enter the classroom each day. We encourage parents and families to reach out for support as much as they would like. We seek to involve our parents and families in decision making through our SAC and numerous activities and surveys throughout the year. We hold each other accountable and seek to challenge our students with high expectations. We are consistent in our expectations for behavior and discipline through PBIS practices and progressive discipline. We practice restorative discipline and often find our students develop the skills they need to improve by talking through alternative behavioral choices.

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

Our stakeholders include our students, teachers, support staff, parents, families, district staff, and community partners. School staff are critical in feeling valued and accepted and part of the school environment. Knowing that they have a voice and contribute allows for the improvement of the overall school climate. Parents and families want to feel that they can assist in decisions that help make the school a great place for their children to attend. The school advisory council and the PTO are made up of all stakeholders and contribute to how money is spent, which activities and events will be held and what goals we will have for the year regarding school improvement. Committees and teams ensure all the workings of the school continue and carry on even when there is some staff turnover. It takes all the stakeholders working together to ensure a positive culture and environment exist at our school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00