

Okeechobee County School District

Okeechobee Achievement Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Okeechobee Achievement Academy

1000 NW 34TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34972

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

Demographics

Principal: Bryan Van Camp

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | Alternative Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade |
| ESSA Status | CS&I |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/8/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Okeechobee Achievement Academy

1000 NW 34TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34972

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Combination School
PK-12

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

Alternative Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

2012-13

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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

Okeechobee Achievement Academy is committed to providing our students a positive, stimulating, and safe learning environment that promotes the development of individual responsibility, acceptable social skills, and academic growth. Upon entering their next step in education, students will be able to make appropriate decisions and experience success in completing their education.

Provide the school's vision statement

Achieving begins with believing.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Van Camp, Bryan | Principal | |
| Finch, Christine | Other | |
| Harden, Jennifer | Administrative Support | |
| Whiteside, Albert | Dean | |
| Mangold, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | |
| Presley, Pamela | Administrative Support | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 9 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 75 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 17 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 48 |

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 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 16 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 31 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 67 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 0% | 0% | 61% | 0% | 0% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 0% | 0% | 59% | 0% | 0% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 0% | 54% | 0% | 0% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 0% | 0% | 62% | 0% | 0% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 0% | 0% | 59% | 0% | 0% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 0% | 52% | 0% | 0% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | 0% | 0% | 56% | 0% | 0% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 0% | 78% | 0% | 0% | 77% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 2 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 11 (0) | 9 (0) | 18 (0) | 10 (0) | 10 (0) | 5 (0) | 75 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 2 (0) | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 12 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 5 (0) | 1 (0) | 1 (0) | 1 (0) | 4 (0) | 0 (0) | 14 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 2 (0) | 4 (0) | 17 (0) | 17 (0) | 3 (0) | 0 (0) | 48 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 0% | 59% | -59% | 58% | -58% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 57% | -57% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 0% | 46% | -46% | 58% | -58% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 41% | -41% | 56% | -56% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 50% | -50% | 56% | -56% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 55% | -55% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 41% | -41% | 52% | -52% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 9% | 38% | -29% | 52% | -43% |
| | 2018 | 17% | 32% | -15% | 51% | -34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 26% | 37% | -11% | 56% | -30% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 40% | -40% | 58% | -58% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 26% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 6% | 40% | -34% | 55% | -49% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 52% | -52% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 40% | 46% | -6% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 42% | -42% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 40% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 40% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 0% | 66% | -66% | 62% | -62% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 62% | -62% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 64% | -64% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 62% | -62% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 60% | -60% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 61% | -61% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 52% | -52% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 27% | 55% | -28% | 54% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 17% | 46% | -29% | 54% | -37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 27% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 5% | 51% | -46% | 46% | -41% |
| | 2018 | 17% | 54% | -37% | 45% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 53% | -53% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 52% | -52% | 55% | -55% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 23% | 41% | -18% | 48% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 37% | -37% | 50% | -50% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 23% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 23% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 64% | -64% | 67% | -67% |
| 2018 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 65% | -65% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 27% | 59% | -32% | 71% | -44% |
| 2018 | 19% | 50% | -31% | 71% | -52% |
| Compare | | 8% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 57% | -57% | 70% | -70% |
| 2018 | 0% | 52% | -52% | 68% | -68% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 13% | 52% | -39% | 61% | -48% |
| 2018 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 62% | -62% |
| Compare | | 13% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 57% | -57% |
| 2018 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 56% | -56% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 18 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 124 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 77% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 21 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 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 | 26 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 31 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 26 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Our lowest performing subject area was Math. The 22-minute math remedial period was unsuccessful. Students were not motivated because the time was ungraded and less structured than regular class time. We simply did not get the results we expected from this intervention.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

Our greatest decline was also Math. Again, the remedial period was unsuccessful.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Math had the greatest gap in performance in comparison to the state. 17% of our students were proficient (3 or higher) as opposed to 61% of the state.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Science showed the most improvement. In 2017-2018, 100% of students were level 1 or 2 in Science. In 2018-2019, 79% of students were level 1 or 2. There were no specific interventions or new resources implemented in our Science classes in 2018-2019.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Because we are an alternative school, nearly every one of our students demonstrate at least one of the early warning indicators. Our primary focus will be on retrieving credit for failed courses.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Improving scores in math, science, and ELA
2. Increase student engagement and time on task in the classroom
3. Differentiation through small group instruction
4. Prescriptive gap closure and remediation with Exact Path

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Title | ELA/Reading |
| Rationale | ELA continues to be a focus area. Only 40% of our tested students made learning gains in 18-19. We expect this number to increase. |

| | |
|---|---|
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Meet or exceed the Florida state averages in ELA for alternative schools. |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
|--|--|

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Evidence-based Strategy | Small group standards based instruction |
|--------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
|--|--|

Action Step

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize resources: Wilson, Reading Works, Top Score Writing, and Edmentum Exact Path 2. Modeling of small group instruction by leadership team 3. Data chats at all levels: teacher/student, coach/teacher, admin/ leadership team 4. 5. |
|--------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |
|---------------------------|---------------------|

| | |
|--|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | Math |
| Rationale | 30% of our students made learning gains in Math in 18-19. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase learning gains in Math by 5% in 19-20. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Small group standards based instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classes vary in grade level and student achievement level, small group standards based instructions is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize resources: Reflex Math, Kahn Academy, Study Island, and Edmentum Exact Path 2. Data chats at all levels: teacher/student, coach/teacher, admin/leadership team 3. Modeling of small group standards based instruction by leadership team 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |
| #3 | |
| Title | Science |
| Rationale | Science scores remain on the decline |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase performance in science by 5% |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Standards based small group instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classes vary in grade level and student achievement level, small group standards based instructions is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data chats at all levels: teacher/student, coach/teacher, admin/leadership team 2. Modeling of small group standards based instruction by leadership team 3. Differentiated small group instruction by teacher |
| Person Responsible | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #4 | |
| Title | Social Studies |
| Rationale | Social Studies scores continue to decline |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase scores on Civics and EOC's by 5% |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Standards based small group instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classes vary in grade level and student achievement level, small group standards based instructions is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modeling of small group instruction by leadership team 2. Data chats at all levels: teacher/student, coach/teacher, admin/leadership team 3. Differentiated small group instruction by teacher 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #5 | |
| Title | Social and Emotional Health |
| Rationale | Many of our students have experienced various degrees of trauma that affect their ability to perform academically and/or engage in appropriate behavior with peers and adults. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Students will engage appropriately with peers and staff, and we will see a reduction in referral numbers by 10%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Albert Whiteside (whitesidea@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | PBIS and consistent classroom procedures |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | On-task, productive behavior is rewarded. Students have daily incentives to encourage time on task and positive behavior in class. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom Dojo for behavior tracking. 2. Intervention system will remain in place for student behavior; ESE specialist will ensure all teachers are aware of student accommodations and that students are receiving accommodations. 3. Dean will update staff on discipline data and appropriate de-escalation strategies. 4. Implementation of Ripple Effects in elective class and ISS. 5. Daily incentive program to encourage on-task, positive behavior. 5. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

| | |
|---|---|
| #6 | |
| Title | Hispanic Population |
| Rationale | Students performing below standard per ESSA Federal Index |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Improve performance of subgroup to meet or exceed federal standards |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Standards Based Small Group Instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize resources: Exact Path, Top Score Writing 2. Modeling of small group instruction by leadership team 3. Data chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |
| #7 | |
| Title | White Population |
| Rationale | Students performing below standard according to ESSA Federal Index |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Improve student performance to meet or exceed federal standard |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Standards based small group instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize resources: Exact Path, Top Score Writing 2. Modeling of small group instruction by leadership team 3. Data Chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

| | |
|--|---|
| #8 | |
| Title | Economically Disadvantaged |
| Rationale | Students performing below standard per ESSA Federal Index |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Improve student performance to meet or exceed federal standard |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Standards based small group instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize Resources: Exact Path; Top Score Writing 2. Modeling of small group standards based instruction by leadership team 3. Data Chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

| | |
|--|---|
| #9 | |
| Title | Students with Disabilities |
| Rationale | Students performing below standard per ESSA Federal Index |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Improve student performance to meet or exceed federal standard |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bryan Van Camp (vancampb@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Small group standards based instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Because our classrooms have a mix of grade levels and student achievement levels, small group standards based instruction is necessary to meet individual student needs. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize resources: Exact Path, Top Score Writing 2. Modeling of small group instruction by leadership team 3. Data chats: teacher/student; admin/teacher 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

In addition to our academic focus, we have an initiative to improve student motivation. Students have a daily opportunity to earn incentive time prior to lunch and prior to dismissal. Students earn the incentive time through on-task, appropriate behavior that is tracked each class period by the teachers and paraprofessionals. Incentive time is the only acceptable time for students to use their cell phones and devices. They may report to supervised areas in the Life Skills room or the pavilion.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Okeechobee County Schools welcome every opportunity to enhance relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school mission and support the needs of students. Open House is an annual activity where students and families are invited on campus to meet their child's teachers, administration and many of the support staff that are in direct contact with students. In addition to Open House, parent nights are held throughout the year and generally focus around a student activity or content area, such as ELA or Math.

Secondary sites even host a CTE Spotlight where community members, students and parents can attend and learn more about the CTE courses and programs that are available at the secondary level.

Elementary sites, participate in APTT, Academic Parent Teacher Teams. APTT meetings occur four times per year where student data is shared on foundational reading and math skills. Parents are able to see exactly where their child is performing compared to other students in the class. Teachers then teach an activity and provide materials for parents utilize at home with their child. These activities will enhance instruction and enrich skills needed to be successful in reading and math.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

The School Counselor facilitates a variety of services through community agencies that include anger management, stress and anxiety groups, bullying prevention, respect education, Too Cool for Violence, Cyber Safety, and Stranger Danger. Age appropriate school-wide mental/behavioral health and prevention curriculum (evidence-based curriculum) are available at all 10 school sites.

- o Second Steps
- o Child Safety Matters
- o Lauren's Kids
- o Stranger Danger/Gun Safety
- o CyberSafety/Netsmartz
- o Bullying (Awareness) Education/Consequences
- o Know the Law
- o Safety Assessment & Intervention
- o Signs of Suicide
- o Say Something
- o Start With Hello
- o Crime Watch (SAVE)
- o D.A.R.E.
- o Elk's Lodge Drug Prevention Program

Supports are delivered in a multi-tiered system based on the level of intervention needed for a specific student. These supports include curriculum, programs and services to address the needs of all students (Tier 1); students who have been identified through the early warning system or universal screening process and require a higher level of service (Tier 2); and students who need intensive intervention and services (Tier 3).

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Preschool sites collaborate with elementary schools to ensure a smooth transition into school. Pre-K students will participate in a field trip to their home school where they will walk the campus, visit the cafeteria, playground and front office. The same is true of elementary transitioning to middle school. A middle school counselor will talk to fifth graders about the transition and accompany them on a field trip to the middle school where they take a tour of the facility.

Secondary sites follow the same procedure to acclimate students to the new facility and or group of teachers. Grade alike Open Houses are held to provide specific information to a cohort of students and parents.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Principal - School Leadership Team Meeting, Data Chats, Professional Development, PLC's, classroom observations

Dean- Discipline, Facilities, Student Support Services

Instructional Coaches- PLC's, Curriculum and Instruction, teacher resources, modeling, coaching

Resource Specialists - IEPs, LEPs,

Behavior Interventionist - MTSS, PBIS

All of the above members serve on the school leadership team, attend leadership team meetings, grade-level team meetings and PLCs. These school leaders also actively

participate in decision-making regarding the coordination of federal, state and local funds; school services and programs, fundraising efforts, allocation of resources, budget concerns, general school operations, school committees and student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Schools are participate in AVID which establishes a school-wide Career and/or College Ready mindset. Schools host career days, reality fairs and have guest speakers from the community to educate students about career opportunities in our local community. Okeechobee's CTE program works with business and industry partners to ensure our students complete CTE courses having the skill set that makes our students employable. Okeechobee has a superb relationship with Indian River State College and high school students may take dual enrollment courses for high school and college credit. Many students graduate with an AA degree at the same time they graduate from high school.