

Glades County School District

Moore Haven 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	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Moore Haven Elementary School

401 TERRIER PRIDE DR SW, Moore Haven, FL 33471

www.gladesedu.org

Demographics

Principal: Kristi Durance

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	86%
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 (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Glades County School Board.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Moore Haven Elementary School

401 TERRIER PRIDE DR SW, Moore Haven, FL 33471

www.gladesedu.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	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	67%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Glades County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of Moore Haven Elementary School to create life-long learners, by providing a quality education in a safe environment of trust, understanding, and respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Striving to be Florida's premier learning organization.

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
Pryor, Leslie	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal with the duties of overseeing student code of conduct, staff evaluations, and the day to day operations of the school
Humphries, Tammy	Reading Coach	The role of the Reading Coach is to assist teachers in monitoring diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments, make instructional decisions based on a Tiered approach to interventions, assist teachers in differentiating instruction to meet student needs, and providing said interventions to students.
Beck, Emma Ruth	Math Coach	The role of the Math Coach is to assist teachers in assessing and monitoring the progress of students in the area of Math. The Math Coach will also assist teachers in developing intervention plans and implementing a Tiered system of support for students struggling in math.
Spivey, Veronica	Teacher, PreK	Grade level chair for Pre K The teachers on the Leadership Team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for the teachers they represent.
Smith, Hayley	Teacher, ESE	Grade level chair ESE The teachers on the Leadership Team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for the teachers they represent.
Dixon, Nicola	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair 1st The teachers on the Leadership Team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for the teachers they represent.
Woodward, Reba	Teacher, K-12	Grade level chair 2nd The teachers on the Leadership Team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for the teachers they represent.
White, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Grade level chair 3rd The teachers on the Leadership Team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for the teachers they represent.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Croskey, Christie	Teacher, K-12	Grade level chair 4th The teachers on the Leadership Team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for the teachers they represent.
Watson, Shelby	Teacher, K-12	Grade level chair 5th The teachers on the Leadership Team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for the teachers they represent.
Mell, Michelle	Principal	The role of the Principal is to assess instructional methods, assess student achievement, provide teachers with opportunities for learning and leading, make staffing decisions, work with parents and the community, provide a safe learning environment, enforce the Code of Conduct, and assist the district in meeting state and federal guidelines.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/13/2021, Kristi Durance

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.*

0

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

366

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

9

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

5

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	50	56	62	69	46	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331
Attendance below 90 percent	18	12	12	14	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	10	8	7	16	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	40	8	1	3	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	3	7	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	6	2	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/3/2021

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	59	59	48	65	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
Attendance below 90 percent	11	8	4	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	10	6	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	1	4	5	2	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	2	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	59	59	48	65	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
Attendance below 90 percent	11	8	4	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	10	6	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	1	4	5	2	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	2	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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				51%	59%	57%	46%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	48%	58%	51%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	42%	53%	55%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	66%	63%	55%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	56%	62%	44%	48%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	43%	51%	30%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	46%	53%	28%	34%	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	50%	62%	-12%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	69%	-21%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	53%	3%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	47%	-8%	53%	-14%
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 for Math and ELA
Science EOY exam

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8	17	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	25	57
	Students With Disabilities	8	13	44
	English Language Learners	2	25	57
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2	21	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	17	42
	Students With Disabilities	8	14	31
	English Language Learners	8	17	42

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	20	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	20	34
	Students With Disabilities	11	11	22
	English Language Learners	11	20	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	10	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	10	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	33
	English Language Learners	9	10	23
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	33	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	33	44
	Students With Disabilities	35	31	38
	English Language Learners	22	33	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	8	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	33	11
	Students With Disabilities	0	23	15
	English Language Learners	0	33	11

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10	20	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	9	17
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	17
	English Language Learners	0	8	39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	8	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	8
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	8
	English Language Learners	4	20	26
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	23	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	31	26
	Students With Disabilities	10	11	11
	English Language Learners	18	23	24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	15	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	23	41
	Students With Disabilities	9	10	11
	English Language Learners	9	15	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	2
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	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	16	20		16	10						
ELL	17			8							
BLK	12	23		6			8				
HSP	23	41		24	23		26				
WHT	35	12		23	24		11				
FRL	19	32		18	16		17				
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	44	45		31	40						
ELL	42			58							
BLK	33	26		33	37		20				
HSP	55	62	50	54	50	33	42				
WHT	55	51	54	66	55	42	52				
FRL	42	45	38	46	40	38	31				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	39		31	40		19				
ELL	18			45							
BLK	20	44		35	29						
HSP	42	51	54	54	45	36	22				
WHT	58	56	60	65	49	40	48				
FRL	43	49	50	56	41	24	27				

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	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	32
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	160
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	19
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	10
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	28
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	21
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	22
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?

students are performing below grade level expectations in all grade levels

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

Math, Reading, and Science

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

Increase in absences and loss of momentum of teaching due to the pandemic. Teacher turnover and hiring and retaining high quality teachers.

Students are back in school on a more consistent basis even though we are still battling Covid-10. We are working with getting teachers certified and reading endorsed. We are also hoping that by improving the culture of the school, teachers will feel supported and want to stay.

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

We did not improve in any areas

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

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

Teachers need to differentiate instruction and plan interventions specific to student needs.

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

iReady training
Oral Reading Fluency Training
Boardworks training
Florida Inclusion Network training

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

Vertical alignment and cross grade level planning sessions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will begin working in Professional Learning Communities where they use data to drive instructional decisions. Data walls, data binders, and data chats will be used to monitor accountability. Teachers will learn about and share best practices to increase student proficiency levels.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of the classroom teachers will be responsible for monitoring students achievement, bringing data to meetings, and discussing data in PLC meetings.
Monitoring:	Teachers will use iReady to monitor the progress of students. Student will work toward 45 minutes per week in reading and math with 80% success on the lessons. These data, along with grades, oral reading fluency, and math fluency will be used to discuss student growth and needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Mell (michelle.mell@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in reading and math using diagnostic data and the iReady Tool Box.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There are many currently 69% of our 5th grade students performing below proficiency in Reading and 60% performing below grade level in Math. There are 40% of our 4th graders performing below grade level in reading and 64% performing below grade level in math. There are 49% of our 3rd graders performing below grade level in reading and 61% performing below grade level in math.

Action Steps to Implement

Attending weekly PLC meetings with the following focus:

Week 1 planning for instruction: What do we want students to know?

Week 2 Planning for assessment: How will we know if they learned it?

Week 3 Planning for interventions: What will we do if they haven't learned it?

Week 4 Planning for students success: What will we do if they have learned it? This will also be a time to address ABC (attendance, behavior and classroom success)

Person Responsible Michelle Mell (michelle.mell@glades-schools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Moore Haven Elementary will use the district Truancy Plan to work with students and families who are exhibiting poor attendance.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the Early Warning System from Pre K to 5th grade will decrease from 98 to 60 students.
Monitoring:	Using the Glades Truancy Program, the assistant principal will follow the steps for communicating with families regarding truant students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leslie Pryor (leslie.pryor@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Glades Truancy Program has been reviewed by the FLDOE and has been deemed a high quality program. Using the steps to this program will assist us with decreasing the number of student absences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Glades Truancy Program has been reviewed by the FLDOE and has been deemed a high quality program. Using the steps to this program will assist us with decreasing the number of student absences. Guidance Counselor will assist with this process once one is hired.
Action Steps to Implement	
Monitor attendance by grade level. Make phone calls when a student has missed more than 3 days of school.	
Person Responsible	Leslie Pryor (leslie.pryor@glades-schools.org)
Integrate district truancy process to work with families to overcome barriers they face in getting students to school.	
Person Responsible	Leslie Pryor (leslie.pryor@glades-schools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	In grades 3-5, less than 50% of the students scored a level 2 or higher on the FSA Spring 2021 assessment. Therefore, intensive interventions and additional supports will be put in place to ensure students show gains and proficiency in reading in grades 3-5.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Students in Grade 3 will increase reading proficiency from 21% to 45% on the Spring 2022 FSA. Students in Grade 4 will increase reading proficiency from 23% to on the Spring 2022 FSA. Students in Grade 5 will increase reading proficiency from 35% to 45% on the Spring 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Students will be monitored using iReady Diagnostic and Growth Monitoring data. Students will also be assessed monthly with Oral Reading Fluency checks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Judy Hubbard (judy.hubbard@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady Teacher Toolbox Oral Reading Fluency using Hasbrouk and Tindall ORF charts Tier 2 intervention consisting of 60 minutes per week Tier 3 interventions consisting of 90 minutes per week using iReady Toolbox teacher led small groups with Reading Endorsed instructors
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have a Title I Reading Coach and a Reading Intervention Specialist who will provide Tier 3 supports to our lowest performing students (Tier 3). These teachers, along with other grade level Reading Endorsed teachers will provide Tier 3 interventions through a Walk To Read model.

Action Steps to Implement

BOY iReady Diagnostic Test
Create data wall in Think Tank with BOY iReady Standards View data

Person Responsible Tammy Humphries (tammy.humphries@glades-schools.org)

Develop Oral Reading Fluency probes and provide professional development for teachers on how to conduct an oral reading fluency check.

Person Responsible Judy Hubbard (judy.hubbard@glades-schools.org)

Work with teachers in PLC meetings to identify Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and build intervention routines and groups. Assign Reading Endorsed instructional personnel to work with these students.

Person Responsible Tammy Humphries (tammy.humphries@glades-schools.org)

Build a schedule for the paraprofessionals so they can provide push in support to Tier 2 students during the reading block at each grade level.

Person Responsible Leslie Pryor (leslie.pryor@glades-schools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Less than 50% of students in Grades 3-5 scored below 25% in Math proficiency according to the 2021 Math FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Students in Grade 3 will increase reading proficiency from 21% to 45% on the Spring 2022 FSA.
 Students in Grade 4 will increase reading proficiency from 23% to 43% on the Spring 2022 FSA.
 Students in Grade 5 will increase reading proficiency from 35% to 45% on the Spring 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: iReady progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Emma Ruth Beck (emmaruth.beck@glades-schools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use iReady Teacher Toolbox to provide interventions for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 Math interventions will be provided small group intensive interventions by additional personnel who will push in to classrooms. A Math Coach will also model lessons and provide support for teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

BOY iReady Math diagnostic
 Build data wall showing student BOY proficiency levels
 Identify Tier 2 and Tier 3 students

Person Responsible Emma Ruth Beck (emmaruth.beck@glades-schools.org)

Provide support to teachers with paraprofessionals pushing in during the reading block

Person Responsible Leslie Pryor (leslie.pryor@glades-schools.org)

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school will begin using restorative practices as a means of repairing relationships, restitution, and behavior management.

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.

Positive Culture is imbedded in the school day from the way teachers greet students in the morning, to dismissal in the afternoon. Parent phone calls are made weekly when students' grades fall below a C. Positive Behavior Referrals are given out to encourage PBIS.

The school is moving towards using restorative practices as an alternative to suspensions and behavior referrals.

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

Parents: Ensure that children are prepared for school, present and on time.

Teachers: Provide instruction that is standards-based and meets the educational needs of students through differentiated instruction.

Administration: Ensures a safe learning environment and sound, research-based instructional practices are being used at all grade levels.

Community Partners: Living Waters Church and the VFW partner with the school to provide materials for students in need.

The Foundation for Glades County Schools provides mini grants to teachers to help them enrich the learning opportunities for students at our school

Partnership with MHMS to provide opportunities for the elementary students to experience the arts.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00