Seminole Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Seminole Elementary School

2690 NW 42ND AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34972

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

Demographics

Principal: Robyn Ziolkowski

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (46%) 2020-21: (41%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	[Kati Pearson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Okeechobee 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of Seminole Elementary to ensure high levels of learning in a safe, respectful environment where all achieve personal and academic success. All means all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The academic focus at SEM is streamlined and reflects our commitment to ensure high levels of learning for all students. We are all committed to:
• working together in collaborative teams
• learning at high levels to ensure success at each grade level
• following these expectations: Be READY – Be RESPECTFUL – Be RESPONSIBLE

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	
Ziolkowski, Robyn	Principal		School / instructional leadership
Smith, Sonya	Assistant Principal		School / instructional leadership
Altman, Sandra	Instructional Coach		Instructional Coach - Supports ELA and Math instruction
Gaucin, Pamela	Guidance Counselor		Supports Attendance and ELL
Peaden, Cassie	Other	Team Leader 2nd Grade	Lead 2nd Grade PLC TEAM - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)
Bishop, Michelle	Other	Team Leader 3rd Grade	Lead 3rd Grade PLC TEAM - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)
Gonzalez, Maribel	Other	Team Leader 4th Grade	Lead 4th Grade PLC TEAM - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)
Gruca-Freeman, Emily	Other	Team Leader 5th Grade	Lead 5th Grade PLC TEAM - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gammill, Alyson	Other	Team Leader 1st Grade	Lead 1st Grade PLC TEAM - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)
Woodham, Bridgette	Other	Kindergarten Team Leader	Lead Kindergarten PLC TEAM - lead development of PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/2/2021, Robyn Ziolkowski

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.*

0

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

500

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

1

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

1

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	87	77	87	96	58	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	4	21	22	15	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	12	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	11	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	41	14	24	27	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	6	6	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/20/2022

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	49%			55%			47%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%			48%			44%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%			27%			42%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	58%			59%			63%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	48%			44%			59%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%			13%			48%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	41%			44%			55%	44%	53%

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	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	46%	-4%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	71%	66%	5%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	56%	10%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

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	17	25	22	28	39	22	15				
ELL	41	53	50	53	41	13	24				
HSP	47	54	55	59	46	19	37				
WHT	54	52	23	58	56	50	52				
FRL	48	54	43	54	46	33	39				

	2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	27		24	13						
ELL	48	38		57	38		46				
HSP	51	46	36	60	47		47				
MUL	82			64							
WHT	58	53		58	33		38				
FRL	52	40	21	55	40	14	39				
	2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	35	38	43	51	55	28				
ELL	44	41	39	64	62	43	55				
BLK	20			50							
HSP	46	43	39	66	62	48	55				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	52	46	41	59	51	39	54				
FRL	43	41	41	60	59	49	55				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
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
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	49
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	46
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?

SEM noted a decline in 2022 FSA data compared to SEM 2019 data on the following measures:
*3rd grade ELA achievement from 53% in 2019 to 49% in 2022
*3rd grade Math achievement from 71% in 2019 to 67% in 2022
*5th grade ELA achievement from 48% in 2019 to 40% in 2022
* 5th grade Math achievement from 66% in 2019 to 40% in 2022
* 5th grade Science achievement from 55% in 2019 to 41% in 2022

In addition, Math Learning Gains showed a decrease from 59% in 2019 to 48% in 2022. The Math Lowest 25%ile decreased from 48% in 2019 to 29% in 2022. Although all subgroups demonstrated a drop in ELA and Math achievement, this drop was not significant enough to fall below the 41% marker except for students with disabilities at 17% in ELA and 28% in Math.

SEM noted a positive increase in 2022 FSA data compared to 2019 data on the following measures:
*4th Grade ELA achievement from 42% in 2019 to 59% in 2022
*4th Grade Math achievement from 66% in 2019 to 71% in 2022

SEM outperformed the district average in 3rd and 4th grade ELA and Math. SEM also outperformed the state average in 3rd grade Math, 4th grade ELA, and 4th grade Math. ELA learning gains increased from 44% in 2019 to 53%. The ELA Lowest 25%ile also showed an increase from 27% in 2021 to 42% in 2022, which was the same as the 2019 outcome.

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

5th grade ELA, Math, and Science, ELA and Math Learning Gains for students who fall in the lowest 25%ile, and ELA and Math achievement for SWD demonstrate 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?

Although we had returned to school in full force in the 2021-2022 school year, consistent attendance remained an area of challenge for SEM. The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic initially caused a disruption during the fall of 2021 to steady student attendance, impacting the receipt of consistent, high-level instruction and in-person support from the teaching staff. In addition, students demonstrated challenging behaviors coupled with inconsistent classroom management, decreased student engagement, lack of strategic, focused instruction on essential standards, poor teacher-student relationships, and decreased student-centered instruction.

This year we commit to ensuring high levels of learning for both teachers and students through the newly adopted implementation of teacher-led Professional Learning Communities at Work (DuFour et al., 2016). SEM PLC TEAMS have committed to the following:
-To plan instruction to ensure that ALL students learn at high levels (i.e., grade level or higher).
-To develop a collaborative culture and collective responsibility for all students.
-To focus on the need for a results orientation and ensure they gather evidence of student learning.
In addition, we commit to providing students with student-centered instruction, timely interventions to ensure their learning on the essential standards, and using the MTSS system with fidelity for students with academic and behavioral challenges. The administration will address attendance deficits with a sense of urgency so students can be present to receive instruction and produce high levels of learning.

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

*ELA learning gains increased from 44% in 2019 to 53% in 2022.
*4th Grade ELA achievement from 42% in 2019 to 59% in 2022
*4th Grade Math achievement from 66% in 2019 to 71% in 2022
* Progress monitoring (I-Ready) indicated a significant increase in 2nd grade Math proficiency

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

SEM piloted a new school-wide focus using the PLC at Work 4 critical questions (i.e., 1) What knowledge, skills, and dispositions should every student acquire as a result of this unit, this course, or this grade level?)2) How will we know if they've learned it? 3) How will we respond when some students do not learn? 4) How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient?). Intervention time was strategically developed and intentionally implemented; this included time for ELA and math interventions. Student-centered instruction, targeted feedback, and reading aloud in multiple opportunities across the instructional day became the foundation. Teachers ensured students were learning at high levels because they collected evidence aligned with grade-level understandings.

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

We changed our morning schedule to give grade-level teams time to complete their PLC TEAMs work. In addition, TEAMs are committed to providing students with focused learning on the essential BEST standards and to utilizing common formative assessment results to ensure student learning. Lesson plans have been changed to reflect the 4 critical questions, and team planning ensures proficiency on essential standards. Teams will implement timely interventions when students are not demonstrating proficiency on the essential standards through the district MTSS system. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions will be developed and implemented with fidelity for students with academic and behavioral challenges. The administration will address attendance in a manner that addresses the urgency of students being present to receive instruction and produce high levels of learning. We are also an AVID school. Utilizing WICOR and student engagement strategies will ensure learning is motivating and challenging for our students. Afterschool tutorial will be offered to students struggling with reading and math.

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.

SEM will form a guiding coalition to lead the PLC at Work process. The team will complete a book study to review and refine the process on an ongoing basis. This group will use this information to ensure organizational and cultural changes create a proper PLC structure built on SEM's mission, vision, values, and goals. The guiding coalition plan and implement PLC at work PD on a weekly and monthly basis. In

addition, teachers and staff will receive ongoing PD on the new assessment systems (i.e., STAR and FAST), the district MTSS process and intervention development and implementation (including for challenging behaviors), and curricular PD in math and ELA. The instructional coach will assist the administration with implementation fidelity of the new curriculum/scope and sequence in ELA and math.

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

SEM will continue to engage TEAMs to work toward collaborative practices that focus on learning by working closely with grade-level TEAM leaders to ensure the implementation of PLC practices and lesson plans. PD will continue to be implemented to ensure teachers are provided with PD that supports their instructional practices. Mentoring support from other schools utilizing the PLC at Work process will be sought out, including reaching out to model schools and working collaboratively with other administrators who have demonstrated success.

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.	School state assessment data and progress monitoring indicates SEM noted a decline in 2022 FSA data compared to SEM 2019 data on the following measures: *3rd grade ELA achievement from 53% in 2019 to 49% in 2022 *5th grade ELA achievement from 48% in 2019 to 40% in 2022
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	--60% of 3rd grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year. --60% of 5th grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	- Monitor growth over the school year using STAR diagnostic assessments at each QUARTER for students who are not demonstrating proficiency on grade-level standards (Data Sheet) - Monitor student proficiency on grade level standards using the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM1 to PM2 to PM3 (Data Sheet) -Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018, page 178). (Noted in grade level lesson plans as they focus on the PLC at Work 4 Critical Questions) -Monitor implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with fidelity on Branching Minds
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	-Lesson plans will include the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure, including evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?) -Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level -Implement high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2012), AVID WICOR strategies to increase student engagement, self efficacy, and proficiency -MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be developed based on progress monitoring data and assessment outcomes
Rationale for Evidence-	When using the PLC at Work TEAMS process, we will achieve grade level or higher learning in all students by focusing on essential standards and creating interventions

based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	and supports for learning that will be immediately put in place if an assessment shows a lack of mastery on the essential standards for that lesson or unit. TEAMs use the teaching-assessing cycle to formulate evidence of student learning so team members can determine what skills remain unmastered, provide interventions (MTSS Tier 2), and identify students who require intensified interventions (MTSS Tier 3). Instruction/ interventions are based on high-impact strategies and research. Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning - John Hattie, Ph,D Learning By Doing - DuFour et al., 2016 RTI at Work - Buffum et al., 2018 What Works Clearing House Practice Guides for Reading

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.

We will monitor PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)

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

Branching Minds will be utilized to track fidelity of MTSS interventions in reading for all grade levels.

Person Responsible   Sonya Smith (sonya.smith@okee.k12.fl.us)

Data sheets and data trackers will be used to monitor assessment outcomes (i.e., Common Formative Assessments, Unit Assessments, FAST, and STAR assessment).

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

Walkthroughs and lesson plans will provide data of implementation of district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level, implementation of high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2012) at every grade level, and/or implementation of AVID WICOR strategies in grades 2 - 5

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

Title IA funds allocated for this area of focus include:
-Salaries for paraprofessionals, migrant advocate, instructional coach, substitutes, technology specialist
-Tech related rentals for Accelerated Reader, Learning A-Z Vocab/Spelling City, Battle Questions
-Supplies and other consumable materials to support classroom instruction: paper, pens, post-it notes, highlighters, markers,guided reading books
-Consumable workbooks for supplemental instruction from Curriculum Associates Magnetic Reading, Wordly Wise
-Instructional Technology: computer hardware and supplies
-Library Books: Battle of the Book

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The ESSA Federal Index has identified a substantial gap in achievement in ELA (17%), Math (28%), and Science (15%) for students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	--51% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will be proficient by the end of the 2022-2023 school year in ELA and Math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	- Monitor growth over the school year using STAR diagnostic assessments at each QUARTER for students who are not demonstrating proficiency on grade-level standards (Data Sheet) - Monitor student proficiency on grade level standards using the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM1 to PM2 to PM3 (Data Sheet) -Monthly progress monitoring on reading skills as indicated (Data Sheet) -Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018, page 178). (Noted in lesson plans: PLC at Work 4 Critical Questions)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	-Lesson plans will include the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure, including evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?) -Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level -Implement high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2012), AVID WICOR strategies to increase student engagement, self efficacy, and proficiency, and research based interventions on foundational skills
Rationale for Evidence-based	When using the PLC at Work TEAMS process, we will achieve grade level or higher learning in all students by focusing on essential standards and creating interventions and supports for learning that will be immediately put in place if an assessment shows lack of

Strategy:	
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	mastery on the essential standards for that lesson or unit. TEAMS use the teaching-assessing cycle to formulate evidence of student learning so team members can determine what learning targets remain unmastered, provide interventions (MTSS Tier 2), and identify students who have a need for intensitifed interventions (MTSS Tier 3). Instruction/interventions are based on high impact strategies and research.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning - John Hattie, Ph,D, 2012 Learning By Doing - DuFour et al., 2016 RTI at Work - Buffum et al., 2018 What Works Clearing House Practice Guides

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.

We will monitor PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)

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

Data sheets and data trackers will be used to monitor assessment outcomes (i.e., Common Formative Assessments, Unit Assessments, FAST, and STAR assessment).

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

Walkthroughs will provide data of implementation of district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level, implementation of high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2012) at every grade level, and/or implementation of AVID WICOR strategies in grades 2 - 5

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

Title IA funds allocated for this area of focus include:
-Salaries for paraprofessionals, migrant advocate, instructional coach, substitutes, technology specialist, Math Bowl coach
-Tech related rentals for Accelerated Reader, Curriculum Associates Teacher Toolbox, Learning A-Z Vocab/Spelling City, Reflex Math, Edmentum Study Island Science Library
-Supplies and other consumable materials to support classroom instruction: paper, pens, post-it notes, highlighters, markers, math manipulatives, lab materials for science, guided reading books
-Consumable workbooks for supplemental instruction Worldly Wise Instructional Technology: computer hardware and supplies
-Library Books: Battle of the Books

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

#3. 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.	School state assessment data and progress monitoring indicates SEM noted a decline in 2022 FSA data compared to SEM 2019 data on the following measures: *3rd grade Math achievement from 71% in 2019 to 67% in 2022 * 5th grade Math achievement from 66% in 2019 to 40% in 2022
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	--60% of 3rd grade students will be proficient in Math by the end of the 2022-2023 school year. --60% of 5th grade students will be proficient in Math by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-Monitor student proficiency on grade level standards using the STAR Math and Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM1 to PM2 to PM3 --Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018, page 178). (Noted in lesson plans: PLC at Work 4 Critical Questions) -Monitor implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with fidelity on Branching Minds
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	-Lesson plans will include the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure, including evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?) -Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level -Implement high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2012), AVID WICOR strategies to increase student engagement, self efficacy, and proficiency -MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be developed based on progress monitoring data and assessment outcomes
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	When using the PLC at Work TEAMS process, we will achieve grade level or higher learning in all students by focusing on essential standards and creating interventions and supports for learning that will be immediately put in place if an assessment shows lack of mastery on the essential standards for that lesson or unit. TEAMS use the teaching-assessing cycle to formulate evidence of student learning so team members can

rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	determine what skills remain unmastered, provide interventions (MTSS Tier 2), and identify students who have a need for intensitifed interventions (MTSS Tier 3). Intstruction/interventions are based on high impact strategies and research.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning - John Hattie, Ph,D Learning By Doing - DuFour et al., 2016 RTI at Work - Buffum et al., 2018 What Works Clearing House Practice Guides for Math

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.

We will monitor PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)

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

Branching Minds will be utilized to track fidelity of MTSS interventions in reading and writing for all grade levels.

Person Responsible Sonya Smith (sonya.smith@okee.k12.fl.us)

Data sheets and data trackers will be used to monitor assessment outcomes (i.e., Common Formative Assessments, Unit Assessments, FAST, and STAR assessment).

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

Walkthroughs will provide data of implementation of district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level, implementation of high impact, visible learning strategies (Hattie et al. 2012) at every grade level, and/or implementation of AVID WICOR strategies in grades 2 - 5

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

Title IA funds allocated for this area of focus include:
-Salaries for paraprofessionals, migrant advocate, instructional coach, substitutes, technology specialist, Math Bowl coach
-Supplies and other consumable materials to support classroom instruction: paper, pens, post-it notes, highlighters, markers, math manipulatives
-Consumable workbooks for supplemental instruction from Acaletics
-Instructional Technology: computer hardware and supplies

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

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	In 2021-22, the district identified 18% of our student population to have 21 or more days absent
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Reduce the percent of students with 21+ absences from 18% of the student population to 5% of the student population by the end of the 2022-23 school year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitored through truancy procedures and attendance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Ziolkowski (robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Relationship building and engagement activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research suggests the following for reducing absenteeism: 1) Establish Positive, Supportive and Engaging School Climate, 2) Establish Positive Relationships with Students and Families, 3) Clarify Attendance Expectations and Goals, 4) Educate and Engage Students and Families About the Impact of Attendance on Achievement, and 5) Recognize Good and Improved Attendance What Works Clearinghouse

Action Steps to Implement
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.

Provide incentives for improved and perfect student attendance through PBIS activities and awards programs.

Person Responsible	Pamela Gaucin (gaucinp@okee.k12.fl.us)

Implement supplemental instructional programs to address students' attitudes toward school, learning and self-esteem (e.g., Start with Hello, Bully Prevention, etc.).

Person Responsible	Pamela Gaucin (gaucinp@okee.k12.fl.us)

Monitor attendance and provide families of individual students who are demonstrating truancy with supports and information on the attendance-achievement connection

Person Responsible   Pamela Gaucin (gaucinp@okee.k12.fl.us)

Title IA funds allocated for this area of focus include:
Supplies and other consumable materials necessary to support family engagement events. Examples: folders, paper, pens, highlighters, post-it notes, markers, foam board, dry erase boards, chart paper, and items for make-and-take academic practice.

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

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

PLCs at Work structure (Lesson Plans, progress monitoring, and assessment results), including the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle, will be utilized with the 4 Critical Questions to monitor student learning and implement interventions when required. Students need strategic instruction in foundational reading to successfully develop literacy skills. The Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade WWC practice guide (based on the science of reading) presents instructional recommendations for teachers in Kindergarten through 2nd grade. To engage students in this high-level learning focus, teachers will implement the following research-based recommendations:
1) Deeply understand and teach the BEST ELA Essential Standards
2) Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity (incorporating the BEST ELA EXPECTATIONS) at every grade level
3) Teach students academic language skills, including inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge.
4) Develop awareness of the segments of sound in speech and how they link to letters.
5) Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.
6) Ensure that each student reads connected text daily to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

7) Create many opportunities to read a range of text types and a range of text levels
8) Provide explicit instruction that incorporates clear feedback.

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

PLCs at Work structure (Lesson Plans, progress monitoring, and assessment results), including the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle, will be utilized with the 4 Critical Questions to monitor student learning and implement interventions when required. Instructional strategies and MTSS interventions can improve reading levels. To engage students in this high-level learning focus, teachers will implement the following:
1) Deeply understand/teach the BEST ELA Essential Standards
2) Implement the district-aligned curriculum with fidelity at every grade level
3) Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words. (i.e., Teach a routine for decoding multisyllabic words; Embed spelling instruction in the comprehension lesson; Engage students in a wide array of activities for practice).
4) Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly (i.e., Provide a purpose for re-reading; Embed prosody in instruction; Regularly provide opportunities for students to read a variety of texts (Read Aloud A LOT!))
5) Routinely use comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text (i.e., Develop world knowledge that is relevant for making sense of the passage; Teach meanings essential for understanding and how to derive meanings of other unknown words using context; Teach prefixes/ suffixes/Latin and Greek Roots)
6) Daily opportunities to practice challenging text above the students' current independent reading level that will expose students to complex ideas/information and increase persistence in making sense of the text.

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)

--90% of Kindergarten students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
--90% of 1st grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
--90% of 2nd grade students wil be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

--60% of 3rd grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
--60% of 4th grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
--60% of 5th grade students will be proficient in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

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.

- Monitor growth over the school year using STAR Reading diagnostic assessments at each QUARTER for students who are not demonstrating proficiency on grade-level standards (Data Sheet)
- Monitor student proficiency on grade level standards using the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM1 to PM2 to PM3 (Data Sheet)
-Monitor implementation of the TEAM teaching-assessing cycle (Buffum et al., 2018, page 178). (Noted in lesson plans: PLC at Work 4 Critical Questions)
-Monitor implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions with fidelity on Branching Minds

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ziolkowski, Robyn, robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us

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. §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?

Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in K-3: 1: Teach students academic language skills, including inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters STRONG; and 3: Teach student to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words STRONG.
Improving Reading Comprehension in K-3: Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies STRONG; Select text purposefully to support comprehension MINIMAL; Establish an engaging and motivating context in which to teach reading comprehension MODERATE; Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text and Part 3A: build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text STRONG 3B: Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read STRONG.

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?

The IES Practice Guide Recommendations provide rationale to support the use of Lalilo by having students complete activities aligned to phonological awareness, phonics, word recognition, comprehension, and grammar.

The IES Practice Guide Recommendations provide rationale to support the use of Freckle by continuously

adapting for student practice in ELA activities while offering teachers the ability to focus practice on grade-level standards. It adapts for the students Zone of Proximal Development while allowing the student to increase proficiency through standards based skill development in ELA.

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
We will monitor PLC TEAMS lesson plans to ensure the inclusion of the 4 Critical Questions of PLCs at Work structure and evidence of the TEAMS teaching-assessing cycle (i.e., Question 1: What do we want students to learn? Question 2: How will we know if they have learned it? Question 3: How do we respond if students don't learn it? Question 4: How do we respond if they already know it?)	Ziolkowski, Robyn, robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us
Branching Minds will be utilized to track fidelity of MTSS interventions in reading for all grade levels.	Smith, Sonya, sonya.smith@okee.k12.fl.us
Data sheets and data trackers will be used to monitor assessment outcomes (i.e., Common Formative Assessments, Unit Assessments, FAST, and STAR assessment).	Ziolkowski, Robyn, robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us
Title IA funds allocated for this area of focus include: Salaries for paraprofessionals, migrant advocate, instructional coach, substitutes, technology specialist, Math Bowl coach Supplies and other consumable materials for the instructional coaches to conduct professional development on effective teaching strategies. Registration and travel for teachers to attend AVID Summer Institute in Orlando, FL Registration and travel for teachers from Title I schools to attend training on implementing the new BEST Standards via UnboundEd Standards Institute	Ziolkowski, Robyn, robyn.ziolkowski@okee.k12.fl.us

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.

SEM utilizes a school-wide PBIS framework designed to improve behavioral and academic outcomes. Teachers can differentiate between minor and significant problem behaviors and work on a Tier 1 level with minor ones. Grade-level teacher teams will collaborate and develop strong team PBIS discipline plans that include elements of Restorative Practice. These plans will clearly outline PBIS reward implementation, including the school-wide Scholar Dollar reward system and grade-level award assemblies. In addition to improving school climate and preventing problem behaviors, the school-wide PBIS framework was designed to promote increased learning time, and positive social skills support through the Seminole 3 R's: Be Ready (e.g., I prepare for class every day), Be Responsible (e.g., I will walk quietly on the right-hand side of the sidewalk), and Be Respectful (e.g., I will not talk when others are talking). These expectations are posted in hallways, common areas, and in every classroom. The meaning behind each expectation is explicitly taught and reinforced through the grade-level discipline plans.

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

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