

Collier County Public Schools

Everglades City School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Everglades City School

415 SCHOOL DR, Everglades City, FL 34139

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Allison

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
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: A (64%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Collier 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

Everglades City School strives to provide a learning environment where students are challenged to become stronger both academically and socially. The school seeks to enlist the support of the community, parents, and all school personnel to partner in developing future leaders and successful members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement

We believe that all students have the ability to be successful leaders. Our goal is to create a learning environment that enhances our students' desire to achieve the highest possible goals that each individual has the ability to reach. By setting high standards and expectations from a student's first day in pre-kindergarten all the way through to their high school graduation, every aspect of our students' education is geared toward assisting all to achieve success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Laudise, Edward	Assistant Principal	
Secory, Shana	Instructional Coach	
Whitcomb, Jill	Instructional Coach	
Owen, Melissa	Instructional Media	
Boyd, Melanie	Teacher, ESE	
Allison, Cherie	Principal	
Sudnick, Deloris	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/23/2020, Cheryl Allison

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
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: A (64%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 .	

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	10	11	13	15	14	10	16	9	13	11	14	16	8	160
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	3	2	0	1	0	1	4	5	1	4	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	3	2	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4	0	3	1	1	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	2	0	1	1	1	15

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	1	1	2	1	4	0	2	11

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	10	12	15	15	11	17	9	14	11	14	15	9	9	161
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	5	3	4	1	3	1	0	2	1	2	27
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	1	0	2	2	2	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	6	0	3	1	3	3	31

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	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	9

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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
Number of students enrolled	10	12	15	15	11	17	9	14	11	14	15	9	9	161
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	5	3	4	1	3	1	0	2	1	2	27
One or more suspensions	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	1	0	2	2	2	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	6	0	3	1	3	3	31

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	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	9

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	51%	59%	61%	43%	56%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	61%	59%	52%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	63%	54%	45%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	66%	62%	49%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	61%	59%	66%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	58%	52%	60%	59%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	45%	46%	56%	45%	62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	83%	78%	75%	86%	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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	58%	-5%	58%	-5%
	2018	30%	60%	-30%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	33%	59%	-26%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
06	2019	35%	56%	-21%	54%	-19%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	70%	55%	15%	52%	18%
	2018	20%	54%	-34%	51%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		50%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	57%	58%	-1%	56%	1%
	2018	53%	63%	-10%	58%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		37%				
09	2019	67%	56%	11%	55%	12%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		67%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	53%	2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-55%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	68%	-26%	62%	-20%
	2018	45%	67%	-22%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	65%	-6%	64%	-5%
	2018	50%	67%	-17%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	0%	67%	-67%	60%	-60%
	2018	44%	68%	-24%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-44%				
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2019	47%	61%	-14%	55%	-8%
	2018	54%	62%	-8%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
07	2019	90%	66%	24%	54%	36%
	2018	64%	67%	-3%	54%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		36%				
08	2019	82%	36%	46%	46%	36%
	2018	60%	43%	17%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	53%	-53%
	2018	22%	58%	-36%	55%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	43%	52%	-9%	48%	-5%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	72%	28%	71%	29%
2018	67%	70%	-3%	71%	-4%
Compare		33%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	72%	11%	70%	13%
2018	82%	72%	10%	68%	14%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	67%	-17%	61%	-11%
2018	32%	67%	-35%	62%	-30%
Compare		18%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%
2018	50%	67%	-17%	56%	-6%
Compare		-50%			

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
SWD	29	54		20	54						
HSP	69	69		53	50						
WHT	51	65	63	63	62	67	42	95		100	50
FRL	51	64	71	57	60	53	36	88			

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
SWD	6	47	45	22	60						
HSP	41			32							
WHT	45	53	41	53	63	50	49	81	18	92	18
FRL	41	54	47	51	68	63	45	74	27		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	64
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	636
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	66
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

Although increasing over the last few years due to our reading coach pushing in, ELA is still the data component with the lowest level of proficiency at 51%

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

Fifth grade science fell to 53% from 55% achievement level. With the introduction of a new 5th grade science teacher we anticipate those numbers to improve.

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

Science had the largest gap (11 points) compared to the state average. Contributing to this gap included having a new teacher as well as ensuring the Science Standards are taught and formative data is used in "real time" to address learning needs.

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

Social Studies revealed the most improvement (16 point overall improvement). On-going use and monitoring of on-line programs such as Prep Works and ICivics as well as the high caliber teaching monitored closely through the FTEM evaluation model.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Areas of concern include 17% of students having a less than 90% attendance rate, 10% of students being a Level 1 on the ELA assessment, 6% of students with 2 or more EWS along with the phased return to school as a result of the COVID pandemic.

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

1. Decrease the number of students scoring a Level 1 or 2 on the ELA assessment
2. Improve student engagement to increase student achievement and decrease the number of students failing core classes.
3. Support students who have 2 or more early warning signs
4. Improve the performance of SWD in both ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focusing on Standards-aligned Instruction will support and facilitate a decrease in Level 1 ELA students, decrease students failing courses and improving the academic achievements of SWD students.

Measureable Outcome: Everglades City Schools aims to decrease Level 1 and 2 ELA scores from 10% to 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edward Laudise (laudie@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Focused Teacher Evaluation Model will be used to monitor Standards-aligned Instruction through classroom observations. Furthermore PLC's and planning will be facilitated to ensure that Standards-aligned Instruction is ongoing. Data based progress monitoring using response to intervention (RTI) Progress monitoring process. Electronic based instruments may include but are not limited to Read180 and System44.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Following Standards-aligned Instruction combined with progress monitoring data based interventions will improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Lesson Plan monitoring, participation in PLC's, classroom observations with specific actionable feedback focused on Standards-aligned Instruction, data monitoring and the use of coaching cycles will improve academic achievement.

Person Responsible Edward Laudise (laudie@collierschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focused intervention and differentiation with Students with Disabilities combined with Standards-aligned Instruction will help student achievement.

Measureable Outcome: Everglades City School aims to increase Learning Gains both in ELA and Math for SWD from 54 points to 60 points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cherie Allison (allisc@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Focused teacher evaluation model with frequent classroom observations, monitoring of lesson plans to include data-driven differentiation along with working with the intervention specialist to monitor progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Ensuring differentiated data based Standards-aligned Instruction occurs with fidelity will improve SWD achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Lesson Plan monitoring for the use of Standards-Based Instruction

Person Responsible Edward Laudise (laudie@collierschools.com)

Continued implementation of Professional learning communities to share best practices

Person Responsible Cherie Allison (allisc@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Leadership will identify and work with students that have 2 or more early warning signs and work with the students and their families. Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports will be used to help support and encourage these and all students. Leadership will work with staff on engagement strategies and highlight effective exemplars when possible. Social Emotional needs of students/families will be addressed through the district-wide Social Emotional Learning initiatives.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Everglades City School strives to improve on the positive culture and environment through a variety of methods. This year the school is focusing on 2 keystone projects; Leader in Me and Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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