

School Board of Levy County

Cedar Key High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cedar Key High School

951 WHIDDON AVE, Cedar Key, FL 32625

<http://www.levyk12.org/schools>

Demographics

Principal: Joshua Slemp

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cedar Key High School

951 WHIDDON AVE, Cedar Key, FL 32625

<http://www.levy12.org/schools>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>9%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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.

Cedar Key School, in conjunction with the community, will provide an education for our students that will encourage them to become academically proficient, life-long learners, skilled communicators and problem-solvers, and productive citizens of their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cedar Key School's vision is for all students to graduate career and college ready, possessing the skills for future success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lawrence, Kathy	Principal	The principal works with the Lead Team to drive the educational plan of the school. The principal develops Lead Team members into School Improvement leaders: they study data, help assess progress towards goals, make course corrections, help implement change, and serve as liaisons between the faculty and the administration for open communication regarding school initiatives. The principal conducts school improvement professional development sessions and holds regular data chats with individual teachers, teacher groups, and students. The principal implements, monitors, and makes adjustments to all school improvement initiatives.
Webb, Jeffrey	Dean	Mr. Jeffrey Webb is the Dean of Students; he supports the academic goals as well as the attendance and behavior goals of this SIP. Mr. Webb teaches math classes in addition to serving as dean, and he helps lead the math department in setting goals and implementing math initiatives.
Campbell, Linda	Reading Coach	Linda, as the school's reading coach, is responsible for supporting ELA goals. She provides professional development, coaches and models in classes, and helps organize reading interventions across the grade levels.
Bishop, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Kim is the school's middle school math teacher and part-time math coach;she is responsible for supporting math goals. She provides professional development, coaches and models in classes, and helps the school increase math achievement.
Adams, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Lauren is a middle and high school ELA teacher and the school's testing coordinator. She helps lead the effort to make our ELA goals.
Andrews, Kearston	Teacher, K-12	Kearston is the fourth and fifth grade math and science teacher on staff and leads the elementary teachers in working toward our ELA and math goals. She attends district meetings on math initiatives and shares the information and training with our staff.
Voyles, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Karen is the lead teacher for the middle school. She leads the teachers in middle school in working toward our ELA, math, science and social studies goals.
Hudson-Lane, Jennie	School Counselor	Jennie-Lynn supports the school with behavioral counseling and works with the SIP Lead Team to support our goals. She ensures that our graduates are college- and career-ready, and she works to reduce the struggles of our students in the Early Warning System. She also coordinates with the Mental Health Provider services to students.
Noyes, Kim	Teacher, ESE	Kim helps support the needs of our SWD population to help us meet our school goals.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crosby, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Jessica is our AVID Site Coordinator and serves as the lead member of our AVID Site Team. The AVID Site Team drives the AVID program at Cedar Key School and helps the faculty implement AVID strategies that are used for this SIP.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/23/2018, Joshua Slemp

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

193

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	16	13	10	16	11	15	10	16	11	7	20	16	21	182
Attendance below 90 percent	4	3	2	4	3	2	1	3	3	1	2	5	4	37
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	6
Course failure in ELA	4	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	9	10	8	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	2	1	1	5	0	3	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4	3	23

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	6	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	17

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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	17	14	15	13	15	13	19	11	5	23	21	24	21	211
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	1	3	10	6	5	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	1	1	3	14	4	6	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	2	4	3	0	2	1	1	3	10	6	5	38

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	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	10	2	4	22

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	17	14	15	13	15	13	19	11	5	23	21	24	21	211
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	1	3	10	6	5	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	1	1	3	14	4	6	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	2	4	3	0	2	1	1	3	10	6	5	38

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	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	10	2	4	22

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	40%	55%				48%	46%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						43%	48%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						47%	46%	54%
Math Achievement	54%	35%	42%				57%	51%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%						55%	51%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						50%	42%	52%
Science Achievement	42%	43%	54%				64%	54%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	47%	59%				88%	78%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	48%	-10%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	13%	44%	-31%	56%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2022					
	2019	58%	41%	17%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2022					
	2019	22%	37%	-15%	52%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2022					
	2019	9%	36%	-27%	56%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	27%	53%	-26%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
06	2022					
	2019	68%	45%	23%	55%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
07	2022					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	54%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	29%	-29%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	43%	29%	48%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	66%	26%	67%	25%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	72%	13%	71%	14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	68%	26%	70%	24%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	55%	57%	-2%	61%	-6%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	79%	53%	26%	57%	22%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	35	67		33	75						
WHT	60	67	67	53	67	69	41	71		100	93
FRL	57	66	64	48	64	62	29	54			
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	29	33		30	29						
WHT	49	57	59	43	41	38	60	74	69	95	95
FRL	45	48	55	39	41	38	58	64		90	
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	27	55	50	27	50	50					
WHT	49	43	45	57	56	50	64	87	68	100	56
FRL	44	44	46	46	52	55	51	92	63		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	687
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Reading achievement is better than math achievement, 61% v. 54%.
 Learning gains of all students were equal, at 66% for both math and English.
 Lowest quartile gains were approximately even, with 67% (ELA) and 69% (math) making gains.
 We are achieving growth for all students and for the lowest quartile.
 Science and Social Studies scores were down; one particular cohort brought our grade down in Science.
 5th grade underperformed.

Other scores to note:

- ELA SWD scores -- 6/18 passing, with 7th through 10th grade 0/8 passing.
- Math SWD scores -- 4/13 passing, with 7th and 9th grade 0/3 passing.
- ELA scores for students with 504 plans -- 9/16 passing.
- Math scores for students with 504 plans -- Algebra 1 0/3 passing; 3rd - 8th math 6/15 passing.
- ELA Retakes: 21 total
- Algebra 1 Retakes: 25 total
- Cohorts of concern: upcoming kindergarten, third, ninth, eleventh, new seniors who lack graduation requirements.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

- ELA SWD scores -- 6/18 passing, with 7th through 10th grade 0/8 passing.
- Math SWD scores -- 4/13 passing, with 7th and 9th grade 0/3 passing.
- Helping all students meet the testing requirements for graduation.
- ELA achievement 61.
- Math achievement 54.
- Science achievement 42.
- Social Studies achievement 69.

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

We have several cohorts of students in high school who perform poorly on assessments. The tenth grade cohort scored poorly on the FSA Biology EOC and caused our traditionally high performance to drop. This cohort of students also has many SWD students, and they did not pass the 10th grade FSA ELA test. We are working to motivate these students to do their best and to use their accommodations for an optimal testing environment.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We improved in all areas of ELA and math (achievement and learning gains). We raised our school grade by 7 percentage points from 62% to 69%.

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

We were able to have school face-to-face with more consistency. We also had a veteran math teacher return to school.

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

We will strengthen our AVID strategies schoolwide to improve instruction. We are training our staff, and we are monitoring the implementation of strategies monthly. We are asking students to take greater ownership of their learning by setting goals in reading and math, with an option of setting goals in other classes as well. We will continue to provide interventions to cohorts of students who struggle to reach grade-level achievement; any student scoring Level 1 or 2 in grades 6-12 is scheduled into an Intensive Reading class in addition to their core ELA class. We offer additional interventions daily in the elementary grades. We will also support new staff: a second grade teacher and a high school social studies teacher.

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.

Our whole faculty is receiving professional development on AVID's WICOR strategies and student goal-setting. Our reading intervention teachers are receiving professional development on their particular supplemental resources. Our new teachers are receiving coaching in instructional methods. Our new second grade teacher is also receiving professional development in elementary AVID strategies, and our new social studies teacher is receiving professional development by College Board for her AP classes.

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

The CKS way of work in whole-faculty SIP goal-setting, data chats, and self-monitoring of strategies is becoming more embedded with all instructional and paraprofessional staff. We are striving to make our best practices more consistent and solid across the grades, K-12. We also continue to look for additional programs and courses that meet the needs of our students: each year we add to our course offerings at school, and we plan to continue that process.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our ELA achievement stayed flat during the pandemic years, from 48% in 2019 to 49% in 2021. In 2022, we moved to 61% achievement. We want to keep increasing the number of students scoring proficient in ELA; literacy is essential to students' being able to achieve their dreams.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In the 2022-2023 school year, ELA Achievement will increase from 61% to 64% as measured by FAST ELA.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We track ELA achievement with progress monitoring assessments: FAST in grades K-10, i-Ready in grades K-5, and IXL in grades 6-12. We also expect all high school retake students to pass the ELA test or earn a concordant score for graduation purposes. Our staff meets on SIP Days three times a year, and we hold faculty data chats throughout the year to analyze progress monitoring data and make course corrections to enable us to reach our goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Students will increase reading levels/fluency using AVID strategies including Academic SMART GOAL Setting and WICOR.
2. Teachers will receive AVID Professional Development to develop plans to increase rigor through Inquiry.
3. Intervention strategies will be used to increase students' level of achievement at the secondary level in scheduled Intensive Reading courses.
4. Intervention strategies will be used to increase students' level of achievement at the elementary level in scheduled intervention classes.

Secondary Intensive Reading resources:

1. IXL - provides individualized instruction using (IES) practices
 - explicit vocabulary instruction (Strong Evidence) and
 - direct, explicit comprehension strategy instruction (Strong Evidence)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

2. Achieve 3000 (Strong Evidence) builds comprehension skills using Informational Text
3. Six-Minute Solutions--provides fluency-building activities (Strong Evidence). Monitoring occurs via monthly fluency checks.
4. Mind Play (Moderate Evidence) builds reading fluency

Programs are monitored through data meetings (school and district), snapshots of data three times a year, and student intervention documentation.

Elementary reading intervention resources:

1. Quick Reads (Strong Evidence)--builds comprehension skills
2. Heggerty Intervention Program--develops awareness of the segments of sounds and links to letters (Strong Evidence).
3. From Phonics to Reading--teaches decoding, word parts, and writing words. This program follows a research-based sequence of phonics (K-3). All programs are monitored via standards-based report card assessments and student intervention documentation.
4. Benchmark Advance (Moderate/Promising) Intervention Program --builds fluency and comprehension

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers will receive training in AVID student goal-setting and WICOR instructional strategies.
2. Teachers will embed WICOR strategies in classroom activities.
3. ELA and math teachers will implement goal-setting with students to increase student ownership of learning.
4. Students scoring below grade level in grades 6-12 will be scheduled into an Intensive Reading class, and teachers will use the resources listed above in classroom instruction.
5. Students scoring below grade level in grades K-5 will be scheduled into a reading intervention class that addresses the student's weaknesses. Teachers will use the resources listed above in classroom instruction.
6. Monitoring of all action steps will occur through sign-in sheets of trainings, monthly "AVID in Action" checks through CWTs and lesson plans, and artifacts, such as parent and student efficacy surveys.

Person Responsible Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our math achievement declined during the pandemic years, from 57% in 2019 to 42% in 2021. In 2022, we moved to 54% achievement. We want to keep increasing the number of students scoring proficient in math as we are not satisfied with this low performance.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In the 2022-2023 school year, math achievement for all students (grades 3-10) will increase from 54% to 56% proficiency as measured on math state assessments (FAST in grade 3-8 and FSA EOCs in Algebra I and Geometry).

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will progress monitor the learning gains and achievement of our students 3 times per year in mathematics with i-Ready in grades K-5, IXL in grades 6-12, STARR test in grades K-2, and new FAST test in grades 3-10. Our faculty will also implement AVID strategies which support our goals. In order to monitor this implementation, CKS classroom teachers will display WICOR strategies used in all content instruction as evident in quarterly CWTs, weekly lesson plans, and professional development participation logs.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The culture of AVID will be fostered daily throughout the entire Cedar Key School K-12. All teachers will work to increase rigor and inquiry through the use of WICOR strategies, with an emphasis on levels of questioning and student goal setting. To increase math proficiency and learning gains of all students, we will increase intervention quality at the elementary level using Focused Math, provide additional support to struggling cohorts of high school students through Math Nation and IXL, and increase the use of real-world problems schoolwide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

WICOR strategies increase students' ability to comprehend text. Prompting student thinking with increased levels of questioning raises students' critical thinking. Additional time on task in mathematics should yield an increase in math achievement.

IXL - (6-12) Teaches students to intentionally choose from alternative algebraic strategies when solving problems.

Math Nation- (High School cohort) Teaches students to utilize the structure of algebraic representations.

Focused Math-(Elementary Interventions) Intervention materials should include

opportunities for students to work with visual representations of mathematical ideas for greater proficiency in problem solving.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teacher training in AVID student goal-setting and WICOR instructional strategies.
2. Teacher implementation of AVID strategies: inquiry to improve rigor, levels of questioning, WICOR, and SMART goal setting in all math classes to increase understanding and problem solving.
3. Additional period of math intervention provided in grades K-5 and math tutorial periods for struggling high school students.
4. Math boot camps implemented prior to state testing for Algebra 1 retake students.
5. Math professional development of the new BEST math standards.
6. Motivation for learning math increased by infusing real-world problems in everyday learning, by inviting guest speakers to talk about math connections in their jobs, and by providing parent help for understanding the BEST standards.
7. Monitoring of all action steps will occur through sign-in sheets of trainings, monthly "AVID in Action" checks through CWTs and lesson plans, and artifacts, such as parent and student efficacy surveys.

Person Responsible Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

CKS is taking a multi-pronged approach to build a positive school culture and environment by ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

--Students are involved with the school-wide integration of the AVID program with emphasis on growth mindset, goal-setting, and ownership of learning which leads the way to developing a positive school culture.

--All students work to pursue goals for future success by partnering with faculty experts, community supporters, college representatives, business leaders and mentors, parents, social services providers, and others.

--The faculty meets regularly to focus on how to advance a positive culture and environment. The Lead

Team meets monthly to plan school events after seeking input and advice from the students and faculty at large. The AVID Lead Team meets monthly to promote the ongoing implementation of the AVID strategies to build an AVID culture at the school. The Literacy Team meets throughout the year to plan literacy events that engage students, family and the community.

--SAC - The school advisory team is made up of both school employees, parents, and community members who provide insight and advice on how to further improve both the activities and the culture of our school. Local businesses, City Commissioners, our school board member, the University of Florida, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service personnel are strategic partners on our SAC.

--PTO - Faculty, staff and parents work monthly on programs to benefit our students, which result in a more positive environment. Members of local organizations work on our PTO to support our students by helping raise funds and plan events for them.

--We maintain an open-door policy and welcome feedback and involvement from parents and families; we are responsive to their needs.

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

In addition to the stakeholders within the school listed above, the following entities support a positive culture at Cedar Key School:

--The Cedar Key community embraces the activities of our school and students. They are heavily involved in providing guest speakers to student groups, raising funds for student scholarships, and volunteering with our sports, arts, academic, and CTE programs.

--Our aquaculture program maintains a model partnership with the University of Florida, the College of Central Florida, the City of Cedar Key, and the Cedar Key Aquaculture Association.

--The district CTE Coordinator supports our Agriculture, Aquaculture, Business, and Hospitality and Tourism programs, which provide our students with real-world experiences and industry certification opportunities.

--The district AVID Coordinator works with our leadership team and whole faculty to promote the spirit of AVID schoolwide on our campus; she also provides our students opportunities to venture beyond Cedar Key to have college and career experiences.

--The Audubon Society and the Cedar Key Arts Center partner with our school to provide art lessons and opportunities to feature student art at gallery openings and festivals.

--A local bluegrass musician provided a class set of ukuleles to the school and teaches ukulele weekly to elementary students. He also brings bluegrass groups to school to perform for our students.

--The University of Florida Department of Fine Arts brings artists yearly to the school as part of their outreach. We have hosted concert pianists, filmmakers, and actors.