

Taylor County School District

Taylor County 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Taylor County Elementary School

1600 E GREEN ST, Perry, FL 32347

http://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_es

Demographics

Principal: Chuck Finley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2020

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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Taylor 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Taylor County Elementary School

1600 E GREEN ST, Perry, FL 32347

http://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_es

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	40%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Taylor 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.

Taylor County Elementary School is committed to providing all students with a safe, positive and challenging learning environment that enables all learners to become well-prepared, productive and contributing citizens in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Taylor County Elementary School will assist all students with the recognition and development of individuality, self-growth and responsibility while using a variety of strategies and cooperative efforts throughout the school, home and community.

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
Bethea, Courtney	Principal	
Poppell, Rachel	Assistant Principal	
Hall, Tracy	Dean	
White, Deana	Instructional Coach	
Lavalle, Cherie	Instructional Coach	
Roberts, Angie	Other	
Sands, Kamryn	Staffing Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/1/2020, Chuck Finley

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.*

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

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

593

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

10

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

8

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	0	0	0	193	179	221	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	63	69	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	33	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	17	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	50	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	45	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	90	58	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277

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	0	0	29	51	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	8	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/29/2021

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	2	3	197	224	195	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	69	44	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	53	38	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	41	41	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
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	

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	0	0	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	3	197	224	195	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	69	44	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	53	38	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	41	41	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
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	

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	0	0	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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				54%	73%	57%	49%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	75%	58%	48%	38%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	56%	53%	39%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	78%	63%	55%	44%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	78%	62%	43%	31%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	56%	51%	30%	30%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	53%	53%	53%	53%	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	58%	59%	-1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	58%	-1%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	46%	-2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	71%	-1%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	67%	0%	64%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Taylor County Elementary School uses iReady as the progress monitoring tool for the school for reading and math, for grades 3-5. Each year three diagnostic assessments are given. Beginning in January of 2021, TCES started a continuous improvement cycle based on data provided by K-12 Lift, after each iReady diagnostic. Teachers, instructional coaches, ESE support staff, and the MTSS coordinator meet to discuss subgroup data and individual teacher and student data during each cycle. These meeting are grade and content area specific and provide valuable time for data based problem solving and instructional strategizing to improve instruction across all tiers. The cycle is a living process and adjusts after each cycle, this is something that TCES will continue to do during the 2021-2022 school year.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73/41%	68/38%	62/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/37%	47/37%	39/31%
	Students With Disabilities	13/24%	14/26%	10/19%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/40%	73/41%	67/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/38%	47/37%	43/34%
	Students With Disabilities	22/41%	20/37%	15/28%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67/31%	63/29%	58/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/23%	35/23%	29/19%
	Students With Disabilities	12/19%	10/16%	8/13%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51/23%	52/24%	47/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/17%	28/19%	25/17%
	Students With Disabilities	11/17%	6/10%	5/8%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71/36%	71/36%	65/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/31%	38/32%	33/28%
	Students With Disabilities	5/8%	5/8%	3/5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61/31%	52/26%	62/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/29%	26/22%	33/28%
	Students With Disabilities	8/13%	5/8%	5/8%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	26	39	31	31	31	33	32				
BLK	19	31	23	23	26	25	13				
HSP	20			33							
MUL	37	44		37	31		38				
WHT	45	39	35	55	36	40	46				
FRL	30	32	27	38	34	39	31				
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	39	49	57	52	62	61	41				
BLK	43	55	56	56	59	54	33				
HSP	50	46		61	62		50				
MUL	55	62		63	86		50				
WHT	58	58	58	69	62	55	59				
FRL	51	55	53	63	60	55	51				
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	28	26	22	47	33	11	35				
BLK	33	46	50	43	38	33	29				
HSP	60	40		64	45		75				
MUL	41	37		51	41	30	50				
WHT	55	51	36	60	44	30	61				
FRL	42	46	41	47	38	29	44				

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	257
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	23
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	37
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	
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	42
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	33
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?

According to progress monitoring data, TCES 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders showed a decrease in proficiency percentages in all subgroups from AP 1 to AP3, with the exception of 5th grade math maintaining the same proficiency percentage from AP1 to AP3.

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

According to progress monitoring data, proficiency among ESE and Economically Disadvantage students in ELA and Math show the greatest need for improvement.

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

Contributing factors for this need for improvement include limited number of students receiving specific intensive intervention. Increased academic intervention for tier 3 students need to be action items to address the need for improvement among ESE students and Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

None

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

N/A

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

Increased strategic instructional interventions, for tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 instruction. More students need to receive tier 3 instructional interventions in order to close previous learning gap. The trends show that students are decreasing in proficiency in Math and ELA as the progress through the grade levels. The level of rigor within tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 instruction must increase in order to close learning gaps and increase proficiency. A focus on attendance and behavior management will be included in data discussions and incentives will be offered in both areas to increase instructional rigor.

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 include weekly collaborative planning times which will support data driven instructional practices. All ELA teachers will receive professional development on the newly adopted ELA curriculum to increase rigor and instructional fidelity and continuity. Increased intervention opportunities will occur throughout the instructional tiers for learners of all achievement levels. The addition of a teacher on special assignment to act as an additional reading coach will allow for experts to focus of content specific coaching strategies and pedagogical practices, for new teachers and veteran teacher alike. Increased walkthroughs by administrators and instructional coaches will provide increased opportunities for instructional feedback.

Additionally, TCES has reimplemented Science progress monitoring and professional development through the use of a consultant, which should increase science proficiency. Due to COVID TCES did not work with a consultant for the 2020-2021 academic year, however this is something that was reimplemented for the 2021-2022 school year, due to previous years of success with this program.

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

Continued efforts to staff additional instructional coaches and intervention opportunities. Continued efforts to ensure for the implementation of collaborative planning and data disaggregation on a weekly basis.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

When reviewing FSA data for the 2020-2021 school year, there was a direct correlation between students scoring in the level 1 range and absenteeism, especially in 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2021-2022 school year 93% of students, staff, and teachers will attend school 95% of the time (10 or less days missed).

Monitoring: Using FOCUS data, parent liaison and truancy officer will notify site based administrators when students have reached 5 days absent. Letters will be sent home and phone calls will be made. Home visits will be made for students who are habitually absent, once the five day letter has been sent home.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Poppell (rachel.poppell@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Incentives and relationship building is being implemented for this Area of Focus. Class rewards for attendance as well as individual students being recognized for being present with our "Suckers for School" initiative will encourage student attendance and provide rewards for doing so. Relationship building and partnerships with students and their families on the part of faculty, admin, parent liaison, and truancy enforcer will create an environment that will encourage families to work with school officials to meet their students needs and block barriers to student attendance. TCES is also looking at a "club model" to implement during the second semester, in an effort to give students additional reasons to want to be at school, this will be readdressed in the mid year review.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

FOCUS data indicated that student and staff absentees are negatively impacting students achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Incentives motivate students.

The district hired truancy enforcers to assist in this absenteeism issue district wide. Having these individuals partner with our Title 1 supported parent liaison will create a better utilization of resources.

Monitoring of attendance.

Parent communication, documented with parent liaison and truancy officers.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2020-2021 ELA curriculum adoption, administrators from the three district K-5 school became aware of a lack of cooperation and collaboration amongst the faculty at the schools. Having seen the pull in various directions, a decision was made at the district administrative retreat to model the process of collaborative planning. TCES also added a collaborative planning time amongst grade levels daily, with Wednesdays being devoted to standards based instructional planning and data discussions.
Measurable Outcome:	-K-5 administrative teams at Taylor County Elementary School, Taylor County Primary School, and Steinhatchee School will have monthly collaboration meetings. We will meet 100% of the time. -TCES teachers will meet every Wednesday during collaborative planning with grade level/ content area peers to discuss student data and standards based instructional practices.
Monitoring:	The TCES Leadership team will have representation from either instructional coaches, the principal, or assistant principal for each collaborative planning time. After each diagnostic assessment, a continuous improvement cycle will be implemented and data will be reviewed grade wide to determine collaborative planning's effectiveness.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Courtney Bethea (courtney.bethea@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based collaborative planning is known to increase, instructional practices and increase student achievement. Data disaggregation and discussion will allow for instructional practices to be ever changing depending on the student needs at the time, both as a grade level, classroom, and individual student. This process will also allow us to better adjust our MTSS tiered levels of instruction for students as needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this process is to increase instructional effectiveness, rigor, and practices, not just for teachers but for how site based administrators monitor said instructional processes. TCES site based administrators saw a lack in rigor for Tier 1 instruction during the 2020-2021 school year, having time to collaborate with peers creates an environment where individuals push each other to increase rigor, encourage standards based instructional effectiveness, and master pedagogical skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning by content/grade level.

Monthly K-5 collaborative meetings among administration.

Tri-annual collaborative problem solving, through the continuous improvement cycle among grade level/ content area.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	K-5 administrators within the district identified ELA achievement as a critical need, based on progress monitoring data.
Measurable Outcome:	75% of students will meet or proceed the 50 percentile ranking by AP3 in reading (ELA).
Monitoring:	iReady diagnostic assessment data and K-12 Lift data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deana White (deana.white@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased intervention opportunities for students based on individual student data collected during collaborative/individual data chats, as well as implementing iReady standards mastery assessment on a more frequent basis. Increase frequency of walkthroughs by instructional coaches and administrators.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In reviewing progress monitoring data, the number of students that appeared to require intensive and strategic intervention increased the need for more intervention opportunities for support.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative meetings for content area/grade level teams.
 Tri-annual collaborative problem solving data chats through the continuous improvement cycle.
 Administrative and instructional coach walkthrough support.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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

K-5 administrators within the district identified Math achievement as a critical need, based on progress monitoring data.

Measurable Outcome:

75% of students will meet or proceed the 50th percentile ranking by AP3 in math.

Monitoring:

iReady diagnostic assessment data and K-12 Lift data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherie Lavalle (cherie.lavalle@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increased intervention opportunities for students based on individual student data collected during collaborative/individual data chats, as well as implementing iReady standards mastery assessment on a more frequent basis. Increase frequency of walkthroughs by instructional coaches and administrators.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In reviewing progress monitoring data, the number of students that appeared to require intensive and strategic intervention increased the need for more intervention opportunities for support.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative meetings for content area/grade level teams.

Tri-annual collaborative problem solving data chats through the continuous improvement cycle.

Administrative and instructional coach walkthrough support.

Person

Responsible [no one identified]

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.

In 2019-2020 (the latest data reported on safe schools), when compared to all 1,395 elementary schools in the state of Florida, Taylor County Elementary School(TCES) ranks 914 in school incident report ranking. TCES rated "very high" in the Drug/Public Order Incidents category the three domains which incidents occurred in this category were one weapons incident, one drug related incident for prescription drug misuse, and one campus disruption incident. TCES ranked "very high" in the total reported suspensions, at 13, 63 out of 1,395. This will be our primary area of focus for the 2021-2022 school year. We will monitor behaviors using PBS and develop alternative consequences to suspension. The PBS team will meet on a regular basis (monthly) to discuss data and develop plans to deter behavior incidents/suspensions. TCES will also be continuing, for the second year in the L.E.A.D. program in conjunction with the sheriffs department and SRD as well as collaborating with school mental health providers during monthly safety meetings to remain proactive with students and situations of concern.

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.

Taylor County Elementary School follows the school district's guiding principals concerning culture and environment. We strive to encourage mutually supportive, active partnerships between our schools, families, and all stakeholders to maximize student potential and contribute to the continued improvement of the district and school mutually. Focus is also implemented on creating a positive, safe, solution-oriented environment that promotes student social, emotional, and academic success. Ensure that all students are educated in a safe learning environment that supports greater opportunities for student-teacher interaction, school connectedness, and the social well-being of each student. At TCES, we have implemented a collaborative planning time into every teachers day. This provides opportunities for all teachers to brainstorm with their peers. A new teacher site-based program has been implemented this school year, to provide additional support to new teachers, which in turn will increase retention. TCES continues to host family engagement activities, and a focus for the school year is incentives. Incentives for attendance, behavior, academic achievement, and citizenship within the school. TCES also has an active PTA and SAC committee who provide valuable input on all things from academic achievement to fundraising. Families are encouraged to participate in all family activities and TCES will soon begin allowing visitors and volunteers in the school again for the first time since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to TCES being located in a rural community, stakeholder input and support is valuable. It takes all stakeholders to provide a positive school culture and environment. TCES address this by continually providing transparency with stakeholders on social media and local news outlets and through seeking their input through SAC, PTA, and DPAC.

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

School Leadership-open communication with all stakeholders through social media, open door policies, family engagement activities, PTA, SAC and DPAC. Communication with staff through email, faculty and staff meetings, bi-weekly site based leadership meetings, monthly safety meetings, and observation and feedback. Participation in PTA, SAC, and DPAC.

Teachers-open communication with parents and students. Providing individual and class incentives. Participation in PTA, SAC, and DPAC. Collaborative planning, including data chats, continued monitoring of student progress.

Support Staff-open communication with school leadership, teachers, and students. participation in PTA, SAC, and DPAC.

Students-students are the most important factor in the school environment. At TCES students participate in a variety of activities/ clubs, including Flag Team, Science Club, and Paper Club. At TCES we are looking into re-implementing a student safety patrol group as well as student government.

Parents-participation in PTA, SAC, and DPAC.

Community Members-participation in PTA, SAC, and DPAC.