

Clay County Schools

Amikids Clay County School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Amikids Clay County

501 LEMON ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

AMikids Clay County's mission is to protect public safety and positively impact as many youth as possible through the efforts of a diverse and innovative staff. We strive to provide a safe, nurturing environment through education, behavior modification, and treatment; to create a community of empowered learners who will become caring, competent, and responsible citizens; and to educate at-risk youth for life-long learning with an uncompromising commitment to excellence; thereby reducing juvenile crime.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AMikids Clay County's Vision: Separating a troubled past from a bright future. Our primary objective is to provide a safe and successful learning environment for troubled youth, while encouraging social and emotional development through achievement of academic and personal goals.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Przybylski, Maria	Principal	Responsible for comprehensive administration of all program operations, academic programming, behavior modification and individual case management. ED functions as chief program administrator to oversee all components of and evidence-based practices. Work includes implementing fundraising initiatives, overseeing financial resources, securing and maintaining relationships with community agencies and managing budget.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School Leadership Team reviews data to identify trends that call for intervention and provide data to teachers, and parents. Teachers work in collaboration with school leadership and instructional coaches to determine what intervention processes should take place, then work with teachers to implement that intervention plan. This action will then lead to the successful completion of SIP Goals.

Parents, students and families are involved in the development of the SIP by attending family engagement activities such as structured Title 1 meetings, family fun days, and campus family activities during which they are asked for feedback, or may complete a questionnaire.

Businesses and community leaders provide the program with continued support through offers of fundraising, mentorship for students, and professional opinion of ways to improve the school.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

AMikids Educational leader will monitor student’s Reading and Math progress monthly, using the data to form instructional interventions. The plan will be revised as necessary, with data updates and intervention planning with the instructional coaches to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	64%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	2022-23: Commendable 2021-22: Commendable 2020-21: Acceptable

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	19

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	17			7			13		
ELA Learning Gains	35			43			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	24			14			5		
Math Learning Gains	31			25			13		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	55			13			5		
Social Studies Achievement*	33			0			10		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	195
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	91
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	17	Yes	2	2
FRL				

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	17	35		24	31		55	33				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	13	15		13	25							
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	7	43		14	25		13	0				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	6	43		15								
FRL	0			10								

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	13	32		5	13		5	10				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0	23		0	9		0					
FRL	16	29		6	17		6	15				

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The lowest performance was ELA achievement at 17%. The contributing factor was a non-effective ELA teacher who has recently been replaced.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was ELA learning gains. Again, the contributing factor was a non-effective ELA teacher who has recently been replaced.

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.

No state average information available.

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

Social Studies achievement increased from 0 to 33. The recruitment of a certified Social Studies teacher greatly impacted this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The greatest area of concern is the ELA achievement and loss of learning gains in the same area.

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

The highest priorities are to recruit certified teachers for any subject area that has a vacant position.
To provide coaching and professional development to teachers.
To provide additional tutoring to students in the areas of ELA and Reading.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

AMIkids will increase the number of students who are proficient in ELA to 41% or higher as assessed in the state FAST test. According to the data analysis, ELA was the lowest performing area for students at AMIkids. The reason for the low performance could be attributed to the lack of an effective, highly-qualified teacher for this subject area. Therefore, in order to increase proficiency in ELA, AMIkids will focus on recruiting, coaching and retaining a highly-qualified ELA teacher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The objective outcome is that students taking the state FAST ELA assessment will score 41% or higher proficiency level by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The Director of Education along with the Executive Director will monitor student FAST scores after each administration. Students that score less than 60% proficiency on either of the first 2 administrations will receive additional tutoring in order to help raise their final score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colby Bias (cbias@ami.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

According to the Institute of Education Sciences Educator's Practice Guide, the following strategies are recommended for ELA intervention:

Recommendation 1. Teach a set of academic vocabulary words intensively across several days using a variety of instructional activities.

Recommendation 2. Integrate oral and written English language instruction into content area teaching.

Recommendation 3. Provide regular, structured opportunities to develop written language skills.

Recommendation 4. Provide small-group instructional intervention to students struggling in areas of literacy and English language development.

In addition to these strategies being implemented in the classroom, students will also have access to tutoring with Catapult tutors who will provide small group or one-on-one interventions. Teachers will have access to a Reading specialist who will provide professional development on how to incorporate reading strategies into daily instruction.

IES Educators Practice Guide April 2014 https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who demonstrate low proficiency in ELA will benefit from having regular structured opportunities to practice the skills that are being taught in the classroom. The more a student is able to practice what they learn, the more likely they are to retain the information and eventually master the skill.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

ELA teacher will work with instructional coach to provide lessons that contain the recommended interventions.

Person Responsible: Colby Bias (cbias@ami.org)

By When: Weekly ongoing follow up will occur throughout the year.

Catapult tutors will use data attained from student progress monitoring to determine which students will benefit most from weekly tutoring sessions. Those with the greatest deficit will begin tutoring right away, with all students eventually participating in tutoring sessions.

Person Responsible: Colby Bias (cbias@ami.org)

By When: Weekly ongoing follow up will occur throughout the year.

We will assess growth through monthly progress monitoring, Flocabulary, Edgenuity, IXL and other web-based resources that will concentrate on individual needs.

Person Responsible: Colby Bias (cbias@ami.org)

By When: Weekly ongoing follow up will occur throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

AMikids will increase the number of students who are proficient in Math to 41% or higher as assessed in the state FAST test. According to the data analysis,

Measurable Outcome:

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

41% or higher proficient on state test.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly assessments, STAR tests, small group activities IXL certificates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colby Bias (cbias@ami.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will be grouped based on academic needs based on assessment results around state standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction will target student deficits surrounding state standard skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teacher retention and recruitment has become an issue faced by not only school districts across the nation, but also for AMIkids. Being a non-profit organization that does not benefit from any additional funding supplied by Florida's Governor to increase teacher pay has made it incredibly hard for AMIkids to compete when it comes to pay. Teacher recruitment has become increasingly more difficult. Recruiting and retaining teachers has become a critical need that has to be addressed and a solution found in order to provide quality education services to students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The desired outcome is to hire effective, certified, highly-qualified teachers, and retain them for as long as possible. In order to accomplish this goal, AMIkids has implemented a retention bonus, instructional coaches and a competitive salary and benefits package.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by the Director of Education and the Executive Director by screening applicants, hiring those that are qualified and appear to be effective educators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski1@amikids.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Effective, highly-qualified teachers will be able to teach subjects that they are skilled at teaching and students will benefit from teachers who have a solid content knowledge of the subject they teach. By retaining highly qualified teachers, the need for continuous training will decrease, creating a cohesive classroom structure. Teachers will become more of a team the longer they work together and students will benefit from their expertise in their content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was chosen because AMIkids has had a significant shortage of certified teachers since the beginning of the 2022-2023 school year. A study completed by the Northwest Comprehensive Center of Education Northwest states, "Developing a stable, high-quality, teaching force that becomes increasingly effective creates a professional learning community that not only reduces teacher failure but also student failure."

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED558138.pdf>

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

Job postings listed in several high-traffic publications where teachers can identify the need at AMikids.

Person Responsible: Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski1@amikids.org)

By When: August 1, 2023

Screen applicants to determine which can be identified as highly-qualified and effective teaching candidates.

Person Responsible: Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski1@amikids.org)

By When: October 1, 2023

Hire desired applicants

Person Responsible: Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski1@amikids.org)

By When: October 31, 2023

Retain candidates through competitive pay, instructional coaching, professional development, and retention bonuses.

Person Responsible: Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski1@amikids.org)

By When: June 30, 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The Executive Director along with the Board of Directors review all funding allocations at monthly meetings to ensure that resources are allocated based upon needs and what is best for the school.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is disseminated through the webpage, and also through hard copies places in the lobby of our location. Because students enroll and leave throughout the year, copies are offered upon enrollment, as well as on an information table located in the lobby. The SIP can be converted to other languages through the SIMs Website.

Website: <https://www.amikids.org/programs-and-services/programs/amikids-clay-county/story/about>

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

AMikids holds several family engagement days each school year, during which students and their families are invited to attend fun activities such as bowling cook outs, field trips, financial planning events etc. During these activities, school personnel communicate the schools mission as well as provide information about student progress. Students also have monthly progress meetings held with all stakeholders that are directly involved with the student's success.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

We plan to hire certified teachers and provide them with an instructional coach and Reading Specialist as well as purchase educational resources such as Nearpod, Flocabulary and IXL. We have also partnered with Catapult tutoring to be sure that students are receiving the maximum access to educators who are ready to help them succeed. AMikids also provides workforce development programing for students where they can earn industry recognized certifications that become valuable tools when they are ready to transition into the workforce.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

AMikids is a program designed to help students get a "fresh start," and provide them skills that will help lead to a brighter future. We participate in the National School Lunch program and provide Career and Technical education on site. Students at AMikids receive Vocational and Employability skills training along with real-world experiences that help to prepare them for the workforce.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

All ESE services are provided by Clay County school district as prescribed in the school board contract. Mentoring services are provided by community stakeholders as well as AMikids personnel. Students are provided opportunity to participate in several project based learning opportunities throughout the year such as the AMikids challenge events, a scuba diving trip, white water rafting, repelling, and legislative day.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

AMIkids employs a career coordinator and job recruiter to work directly with students, preparing students for the workforce. Students complete a career interest inventory upon enrollment and based upon the results, they are given the opportunity to explore different career paths.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

AMIkids Personal Growth Model is designed to target and reduce risk factors that sustain negative behavior and academic failure, improve successful program completion rates and promote academic achievement.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

AMIkids provides professional learning through weekly Small Learning Community meetings, annual Education and Workforce Development Conferences, and regular meetings with instructional coaches.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$1,155.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$1,155.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of classroom sets of novels for novel study. Titles to include Diary of Anne Frank, The River, Hatchet, The Maze Runner</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$46,345.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	521	0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$770.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of Math Game Cards: Fluency and Number Sense through Puzzle and Play, Grades 6-8 Purchase of Daily Routines to Jump Start Math Class, Middle School. Both by Didax. Purchase of Geometry Manipulatives</i>			
	5100	622	0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$335.00

			<i>Notes: Purchase of Hand2Mind Magnetic Percent Bar Answer Boards, Grades 3 through 8. Class set of 24.</i>			
5100	649		0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$28,240.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of Coding Robotics Kits, Meta Quest 2, Virtual Reality Headsets, and Science Experiment Kits</i>			
5100	150		0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG	0.5	\$12,300.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase part time staff to implement small group instruction in Math utilizing hands on manipulatives</i>			
5100	210		0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$1,670.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement: 13.57%</i>			
5100	220		0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$940.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security: 7.65%</i>			
5100	230		0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$1,906.00
			<i>Notes: Group Health Insurance: 15.5%</i>			
5100	240		0113 - Amikids Clay County	UniSIG		\$184.00
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation: 1.43%</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$0.00
					Total:	\$47,500.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes

Clay County Schools

Argyle Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://aes.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Argyle Elementary School is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant, and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Argyle Elementary School is to equip students with the skills needed to forge the future's next discoveries, inventions, solutions and adventures in a world of new possibilities.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mainer, Dimitra	Principal	The function of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction for all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-2 Foundational Skills Assessment or alternative, 5th-grade Performance Matters benchmark science assessments (and other locally-created common assessments), and formal assessments such as the FSA or SAT-10. The Principal is a participant in the meeting. The Assistant Principal will attend the discussions in a support role for the Principal. The reading committee chairperson may provide effective interventions for the Tier 1, 2, or 3 instructional needs, as does the math committee chairperson in order to make recommendations for Math. The Intervention Team Facilitator is present to help ensure that the district's MTSS plan is followed. Lead teachers sometimes serve on the SBLT as a liaison to other teachers in their grade/ content area grouping.
Neese, Shannon	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will attend the meetings in a support role for the Principal.
Leone, Casey	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will attend the meetings in a support role for the Principal.
Sutton, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Sutton is the Kindergarten Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Miller, Traci	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Miller is the 6th-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Williams, Tara	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. William's is the ESE Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Nzuzu, Tamisha	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Nzuzu is the 1st-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Armenta, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Armenta is the 3rd-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stanhope, Amber	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Stanhope is the 4th-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Jenkins, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Jenkins is the 2nd-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Matthews, Kayla	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Matthews is the 5th-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Aldridge, Nicole	School Counselor	Mrs. Aldridge is the School Counselor. In this role, she will provide input regarding testing and guidance issues. She will also offer support with data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Calloway-McCray, Deirdre	Other	Mrs. Calloway-McCray is our Title I Lead Teacher. In this role, she will provide leadership in carrying out the educational program of the school as it relates to Title 1.
Devine, Ariel	Behavior Specialist	Ms. Devine is our Behavior Site Coach. In this role, she serves as a site-based resource person to provide positive behavior support and expertise for all students. She provides instruction in life skills, conflict resolution, peer mediation, self-esteem building, and any other area as the need arises.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Quarterly School Advisory Council meetings will be held during the school year to involve all stakeholders in school improvement efforts. During the 1st-quarter SAC meeting, the SIP will be presented and reviewed and feedback and input from stakeholders will be encouraged and reflected upon before the final SIP is approved and published.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Quarterly School Advisory Council meetings will be held during the school year to involve all stakeholders in school improvement efforts. At each meeting, schoolwide progress monitoring data will be reviewed to ensure that student achievement and proficiency rates are in alignment with our established SIP goals. Adjustments to the plan, as needed, will be agreed upon by all stakeholders during these meetings to maximize effective instructional strategies to propel student learning.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	27	28	20	26	18	24	22	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	6	3	4	5	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	2	4	0	9	1	15	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	22	15	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	18	14	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	6	1	17	8	23	16	0	0	74

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	37	36	28	21	26	27	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	24	27	19	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	77

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	37	36	28	21	26	27	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	24	27	19	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	77

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56			59			65		
ELA Learning Gains	54			55			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46			33			57		
Math Achievement*	59			53			72		
Math Learning Gains	66			39			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54			33			57		
Science Achievement*	48			39			67		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress							75		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	59			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	46			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	54	46	59	66	54	48					
SWD	31	40	46	35	57	50	21					
ELL	29	47		31	79							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51	53	48	50	55	39	39					
HSP	57	52	27	63	75	78	64					
MUL	60	79		62	80		36					
PAC												
WHT	60	49	42	64	63	36	48					
FRL	44	47	46	46	57	44	37					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	55	33	53	39	33	39					
SWD	47	49	8	43	41	29	33					
ELL	46	62		38	31							
AMI												
ASN	60			60								
BLK	50	54	20	43	42	60	43					
HSP	57	56	42	52	31	15	27					
MUL	69	55		55	36							
PAC												
WHT	64	54	40	62	42	36	44					
FRL	49	50	27	48	45	45	24					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	66	57	72	68	57	67					75
SWD	46	59	55	55	67	63	53					
ELL	56	54		67	93							75
AMI												
ASN	71	73		86	91							
BLK	52	63	67	67	66	69	60					
HSP	68	75	73	73	74	62	75					
MUL	79	87		67	64							
PAC												
WHT	69	58	38	76	66	39	67					
FRL	59	65	67	68	68	57	65					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our achievement/proficiency rate in ELA. Based on our 2023 FAST ELA Spring scores, AES scholars were 50% proficient in the content area of ELA. Attendance (in all grades) and teacher allocation in fifth grade had a significant impact on student performance. Likewise, we had a large population of first-year teachers join our team last year. Although it is exciting to welcome beginning educators to the profession, there is also a learning curve when it comes to building teaching capacity in providing strong tier-1 instruction. Lastly, in fifth grade, we experienced high teacher turnover rates and assigned several long-term subs to those classrooms. Other contributing factors include more instructional development in targeting individual student needs, calibrating alignment of instruction in small groups and whole groups, and greater oversight via explicit progress monitoring. Based on student performance on statewide and local assessments, the trend in ELA proficiency has been declining since 2018/19.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline from the prior year were our achievement/proficiency rates in ELA and Mathematics. When comparing our 2023 and 2022 scores, we dropped by 6 percentage points in both content areas. The volatility of attendance (in all grades) and teacher allocation in fifth grade had a significant impact on student performance. Likewise, we had a large population of first-year teachers join our team last year. Although it is exciting to welcome beginning educators to the profession, there is also a learning curve when it comes to building teaching capacity in providing strong tier-1 instruction. Lastly, in fifth grade, we experienced high teacher turnover rates and assigned several long-term subs to those classrooms. Other contributing factors include more instructional development in targeting individual student needs, calibrating alignment of instruction in small groups and whole groups, and greater oversight via explicit progress monitoring.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Mathematics, although ELA was not far behind. Our Mathematics score was 2 percentage points lower than the state. Our ELA score was 4 percentage points lower than the state. Attendance (in all grades) and teacher allocation in fifth grade had a significant impact on student performance. Likewise, we had a large population of first-year teachers join our team last year. Although it is exciting to welcome beginning educators to the profession, there is also a learning curve when it comes to building teaching capacity in providing strong tier-1 instruction. Lastly, in fifth grade, we experienced high teacher turnover rates and assigned several long-term subs to those classrooms. Other contributing factors include more instructional development in targeting individual student needs, calibrating alignment of instruction in small groups and whole groups, and greater oversight via explicit progress monitoring.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the prior year was our achievement/proficiency rate in Science. When comparing our 2023 and 2022 scores, we gained 17 percentage

points in this area. Science teachers embraced professional development opportunities offered by the district. Many of our teachers consistently participated in the science collaboratives offered by district-level science curriculum specialists, allowing them to collaboratively plan with experts as well as other teachers throughout the district.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

After reviewing and reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, one area of major concern is only many students we had in 5th grade who displayed two or more indicators (23 total students), as compared to the rest of the school community. The following indicators are potential areas of concern:

Absent 10% or more days: 24

Course Failure in Math: 15

Level 1 on ELA: 22

Level 1 on Math: 18

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

Teachers will continue to be trained on new reading materials (SAVVAS, Heggerty) as well as supplementary instructional programs to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, many of whom comprise our lower quartile and/or ESE population. Teachers will be provided with professional development on the use of Learning Targets, Checking for Understanding, and Aligning Instruction to Checks for Understanding to promote quality teaching and learning, as well as the most effective strategies for implementing small groups so that student needs will be addressed frequently and consistently. Through PLCs and Vertical Teams, continuous progress monitoring, with consistent feedback from learning teams and administration will ensure that practice is refined on an ongoing basis. Teachers will have a deeper understanding of instructional strategies that align with BEST ELA and Math standards and the MTRs to promote student achievement. They will learn to use the components of the standards to ensure alignment between instructional delivery and grade-level expectations for mastery. Teachers will also learn how to use PENDA science to diagnose student strengths and weaknesses and target remediation, as needed. They will learn strategies for high-impact remedial instruction. Assistants who provide small group instruction in math will learn about RDW and Eureka math strategies for conceptual understanding of math concepts. They will learn how to use strategic question stems and strategies to promote productive struggle and increase the attainment of standards mastery.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have chosen to focus on increasing student proficiency rates within the ELA content area. As reflected by current FAST data, our proficiency rate ELA was 50% for the 2022-2023 school year. We identified this as a critical need because proficiency rates reflect learning gaps. If our proficiency increases, that shows that our students' learning gaps are decreasing. That is our goal, to close those gaps that students have and help them achieve more academic success. Likewise, our ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities is performing below the federal percent of points index. To target this, special attention will be made to embed the following evidence-based strategies into daily classroom instruction:

Data-drive small group instruction.

Implementation of an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.

Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.

Explicit vocabulary instruction.

Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Reading. By implementing research-based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student proficiency from 50% to 56% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Data monitoring sources will include FAST, Lexia, classroom assessments, etc. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor this area of focus for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:

Data-drive small group instruction.

Implementation of an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.

Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.

Explicit vocabulary instruction.

Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the area of ELA. Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and

general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialized in high-impact classroom strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity, thus improving student proficiency rates.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Small Group Instruction: Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small group instruction. These assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups. Data-drive all group instructional will be conducted daily in ALL ELA classrooms on campus. In addition, at least three data chats will be held during the year to review instructional data, EWS, and MTSS as well as to plan data-driven instructional opportunities via whole-group and small-group instruction. Substitutes will be hired to facilitate teacher attendance at these meetings.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. We will hire a Title I Instructional Coach to assist ELA teachers with instruction planning and execution. Large-screen interactive monitors will be used for whole-group instruction to provide engaging multi-sensory instruction.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Direct-explicit ELA instruction: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. Classrooms will receive a set of recommended novels in the Florida BEST standards to supplement SAVVAS.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Explicit vocabulary instruction: Spelling Morphology will be used in small groups to support vocabulary instruction for explicit, systematic, cumulative, multi-sensory morphology (word parts: morphemes), decoding, and encoding.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Teachers engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together: We will develop grade-level, appropriate ELA instructional support materials parents can use at home to support their students' learning throughout the year. Parental support for how to use the materials will be provided during parent and family engagement events and activities.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have chosen to focus on increasing student proficiency rates within the Math content area. As reflected by current FAST data, our proficiency rate in Math was 53% for the 2022-2023 school year. We identified this as a critical need because proficiency rates reflect learning gaps. If our proficiency increases, that shows that our students' learning gaps are decreasing. That is our goal, to close those gaps that students have and help them to achieve more academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math. By implementing research-based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student proficiency from 53% to 59% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Data monitoring sources will include FAST, iReady, ALEKS, classroom common assessments, etc. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor this area of focus for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:

- Individual and Small-Group Instruction
- Frequent Student Practice
- Visual Representations
- Demonstrate Multiple Problem-Solving Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the area of Math. Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialized in high-impact classroom

strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity, thus improving student proficiency rates.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Individual and Small Group Instruction: Data-driven small group instruction will occur daily in ALL Math classrooms. Small group instructional resources including anchor charts, manipulatives, dry-erase boards, markers, etc. will be provided. In addition, at least three data chats will be held during the year to review instructional data, EWS, and MTSS as well as to plan data-driven instructional opportunities via whole-group and small-group instruction. Substitutes will be hired to facilitate teacher attendance at these meetings. We will hire a Title I Instructional Coach to assist Math teachers with instruction planning and execution.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Frequent Student Practice: Students will focus on math fact fluency through the Reflex Math Fluency Program used by all math students K-5 and ALEKS used daily by all 6th-grade math students. Students will use Chromebooks and related technology supplies to use Relex Math in K-5, ALEKS in 6th grade, and iReady K-5.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Visual Representations: K-6 Math teachers will be invited to join a book study of "Building Thinking Classrooms in Math". A book study guide will be provided for all teachers to work through during the year. We will also provide recommended mathematical instructional tools throughout professional learning. Eureka Squared Math manipulative kits will be provided to all K-6 math teachers.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Demonstrate Multiple Problem-Solving Strategies: All K-6 Math teachers will use the Eureka Squared curriculum as adopted by the school district. Large Screen interactive monitors will be used for whole-group instruction to provide engaging, multi-sensory ways for students to explore mathematical problem-solving.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Inadequate student awareness and knowledge of behavioral expectations result in increased disciplinary actions of scholars, contributing to a lack of self-determination and self-motivation. An increase in disciplinary action, in turn, leads to a substantial decrease in total instructional time for affected students. If students know, practice, and are recognized for appropriate behaviors, then inappropriate behaviors will be reduced overall. This reduction will lead to more student/teacher contact time, increasing student confidence and engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on Synergy discipline data, our area of focus will be school-wide behavior. During the 2022-2023 school year, Argyle teachers reported 171 disciplinary incidents. By implementing research-based strategies and an intentional PBIS action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student engagement which will in turn decrease discipline referrals by at least 30% for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Synergy discipline data will be pulled every nine weeks. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to further track the progress of this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:

Teacher Access to Training, Coaching, and Feedback
 Define and Teach Positive Connections
 Create and Provide a Continuum of Response Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement the schoolwide, adopted PBIS strategies with fidelity, then student disciplinary action will decrease and student instructional time will increase. By teaching and defining positive expectations, we are ensuring that all students have a clear understanding of expected behaviors and we are teaching new life skill competencies. By establishing positive connections, students are more likely to engage in positive behaviors.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teacher Access to Training, Coaching, and Feedback: Teacher leaders will participate in a 3-day PBIS reboot to discuss schoolwide positive behavior supports and expectations. They can then train their team teachers in preparation for implementation. Likewise, all faculty and staff will participate in a condensed version of the PBIS reboot during pre-planning to further communicate the school-adopted PBIS initiative.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implementation will begin during pre-planning and continue during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Define and Teach Positive Expectations: Teachers will explicitly teach expectations using examples and student practice through provided lesson plans. Student expectations will be clearly posted in classrooms and around campus, so they may be referred to when interacting with students or correcting behaviors. PATHS (our school-based PBIS initiative) will be displayed during the morning news to provide time for reflection on how their school day will begin and end.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Establish Positive Connections: Teachers will use effective praise that is specific, timely, and sincere that works for each individual student.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Create & Provide a Continuum of Response Strategies: Token economies such as Pioneer Bucks can be earned and collected to make purchases from the school's PBIS store once per quarter. Students will be celebrated when they complete their PATHS passports by modeling the schoolwide expectations. Students who demonstrate positive behavior will be selected by their teacher once per quarter to join the administration team for a pancake breakfast. The book "Flooded" will be used as a book study for K-6 teachers. This study will take place throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have chosen to focus on increasing student proficiency rates within the ELA content area, specifically relating to the learning of our students with disabilities. After a review of our ESSA Subgroup Data, we identified that our students with disabilities are performing below the federal percent of points index of 41%. Our students with disabilities are currently performing at 40%. Multiple measures will be initiated to aid in increasing this decline to include:

Collaborative planning with the Florida Inclusion Network.

Inclusive scheduling with the Florida Inclusion Network.

Continual professional development opportunities to increase the instructional capacity of ESE teachers and classroom teachers (i.e. ongoing professional development on new district-adopted curriculum as well as supplementary instructional programs to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, many of whom comprise our lower quartile and SWD population).

Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small-group instruction; assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups.

Targeted instructional book studies will be implemented to strengthen teacher understanding of high-leverage, research-based intervention strategies as well as strong Tier 1 instruction.

Data-drive small group instruction.

Implementation of an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.

Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.

Explicit vocabulary instruction.

Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Reading. By implementing research-based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase the overall student proficiency of students with disabilities, increasing their federal index score from 40% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Data monitoring sources will include FAST, Lexia, classroom assessments, etc. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor this area of focus for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:

Data-drive small group instruction.

Implementation of an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.

Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.

Explicit vocabulary instruction.

Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the area of ELA. Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialized in high-impact classroom

strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity, thus improving student proficiency rates.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Small Group Instruction: Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small group instruction. These assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups. Data-drive all group instructional will be conducted daily in ALL ELA classrooms on campus. In addition, at least three data chats will be held during the year to review instructional data, EWS, and MTSS as well as to plan data-driven instructional opportunities via whole-group and small-group instruction. Substitutes will be hired to facilitate teacher attendance at these meetings.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. We will hire a Title I Instructional Coach to assist ELA teachers with instruction planning and execution. Large-screen interactive monitors will be used for whole-group instruction to provide engaging multi-sensory instruction.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Direct-explicit ELA instruction: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. Classrooms will receive a set of recommended novels in the Florida BEST standards to supplement SAVVAS.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Explicit vocabulary instruction: Spelling Morphology will be used in small groups to support vocabulary instruction for explicit, systematic, cumulative, multi-sensory morphology (word parts: morphemes), decoding, and encoding.

Person Responsible: Shannon Neese (shannon.neese@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Teachers engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together: We will develop grade-level, appropriate ELA instructional support materials parents can use at home to support their students' learning throughout the year. Parental support for how to use the materials will be provided during parent and family engagement events and activities.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

After a review of our ESSA Subgroup Data, we identified that our students with disabilities are performing below the federal percent of points index of 41%. Our students with disabilities are currently performing at 40%. Multiple measures will be initiated to aid in increasing this decline to include:

Collaborative planning with the Florida Inclusion Network.

Inclusive scheduling with the Florida Inclusion Network.

Continual professional development opportunities to increase the instructional capacity of ESE teachers and classroom teachers (i.e. ongoing professional development on new district-adopted curriculum as well as supplementary instructional programs to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, many of whom comprise our lower quartile and SWD population).

Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small-group instruction; assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups.

Targeted instructional book studies will be implemented to strengthen teacher understanding of high-leverage, research-based intervention strategies as well as strong Tier 1 instruction.

Clay County Schools

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center

608 MILL ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://blc.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bannerman Learning Center's mission is to create a positive, safe and supportive environment that promotes excellence in teaching and learning. The unique potential of each individual is recognized and encouraged in a challenging and diverse setting. Through the growth and advancement of students and staff, knowledge and skills are gained to meet life's challenges and develop active, responsible citizens for our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bannerman Learning Center exists to prepare all students to be successful in a positive manner in a competitive workplace and community. Students will thrive in a safe and welcoming environment, foster mutual respect between students and staff while focusing on returning to their home school or preparing to enlist in the military, enroll in college or become gainfully employed.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Palmer, Stephanie	Principal	Responsible for implementing and facilitating PBIS programs while providing professional development for staff that fosters growth in PBIS, SEL programs, and raising the academic expectations of students, faculty and staff.
Cox, Brian	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in all aspects of instruction and operation of school functions.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Student, families, community partners, and staff feedback from entry and exit interview data provide communication to improve opportunities, relay satisfaction, and increase knowledge of programs at Bannerman Learning Center. School and student leadership meet monthly to discuss feedback data and asses current progress towards school goals.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School and student leadership meet monthly to monitor progress towards school goals, review progress monitoring data in our four ESSA sub groups, and evaluate effectiveness of programs in place. Weekly professional learning communities calibrate through data to provide quality instruction, attendance, and positive behavior expectations.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	27	96

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	31

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days									4	3	7
One or more suspensions									1	2	3
Course failure in ELA									0	0	0
Course failure in Math									0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment									9	23	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment									8	26	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.									12	27	39

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	20

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	2			29			15		
ELA Learning Gains	12			15			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	4			13			5		
Math Learning Gains	16			18			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	2			29			11		
Social Studies Achievement*	9			31			24		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	67			65			32		
College and Career Acceleration	14			13			21		
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	126
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	59
Graduation Rate	67

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	20	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	2
HSP	42			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	23	Yes	3	3
FRL	20	Yes	3	3

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	2	12		4	16		2	9		67	14	
SWD	5	20		9	18			30		61	0	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				0						80	10	
HSP										69	15	
MUL										47		
PAC												
WHT	5	20		16	30		8			64	16	
FRL	5	15		9	19		7	29		62	12	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	29	15		13	18		29	31		65	13	
SWD	38	20		17	22		27			62	16	
ELL										83	10	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										69	4	
HSP										81	5	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33	10		9	6			30		61	17	
FRL	31	20		14	27		30			64	13	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	15	33		5	28		11	24		32	21	
SWD	22	29		17	36		20	29		28		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	6	36					10			38		
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	19	33		14	25		15	27		30	18	
FRL	13	29		21	20		14	21		22		

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Math 86.8% were level 1.

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

Social Studies went from 37.5 % to 60% level 1 achievement scores.

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, -58%, when compared to the state average.

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

Science had the smallest percentage decrease, -5.1%, of all data components.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Math and ELA achievement levels.

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

We are focused on increasing learning gains in Math followed by ELA.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We are focused on increasing outcomes in attendance, academics, and behavior through positive behavior interventions and support a tiered model that is flexible enough to support student, family, and community needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase from 23% to 28% in the White student population returning to their zoned school based on positive responses to interventions in place that address academic, attendance and behavior.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored through hourly and daily student point sheets, PLC meetings, monthly through staff and student leadership meetings, and quarterly student review meetings. Data is defined, documented, outlines outcomes, and evaluates effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We created a shared vision and approach to support and respond to student expectations. We established 3 positive school-wide expectations addressing social, emotional, and behavioral skills for student success. We utilize a continuum of recognition strategies to provide specific feedback and encourage student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide positive behavior interventions and supports is a multi-tiered system that improves attendance, behavior, and academic outcomes for student success while being flexible to student, family, and community needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set observable and measurable goal:

Academics- track data of mastery learning. Students will earn C's or higher or remediation will be provided.

Attendance- students will meet the criteria for attendance according to the Code of Conduct.

Behaviors- students will demonstrate compliance with Code of Conduct to earn review.
Establish 3 school-wide expectations that are defined, explicitly taught, and monitored for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Individualize student quarterly reviews of progress.

Set observable and measurable goal:

Academics- track data of mastery learning. Students will earn C's or higher or remediation will be provided.

Attendance- students will meet the criteria for attendance according to the Code of Conduct.

Behaviors- students will demonstrate compliance with Code of Conduct to earn review.

Establish 3 school-wide expectations that are defined, explicitly taught, and monitored for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Individualize student quarterly reviews of progress.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We are focused on increasing outcomes in attendance, academics, and behavior through positive behavior interventions and support a tiered model that is flexible enough to support student, family, and community needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase overall student attendance from 63% to 68% thus increasing students returning to their zoned school based on positive responses to interventions in place that address academic, attendance and behavior.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored through hourly and daily student point sheets, PLC meetings, monthly through staff and student leadership meetings, and quarterly student review meetings. Data is defined, documented, outlines outcomes, and evaluates effectiveness

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We created a shared vision and approach to support and respond to student expectations. We established 3 positive school-wide expectations addressing social, emotional, and behavioral skills for student success. We utilize a continuum of recognition strategies to provide specific feedback and encourage student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide positive behavior interventions and support is a multi-tiered system that improves attendance, behavior, and academic outcomes for student success while being flexible to student, family, and community needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set observable and measurable goal:

Academics- track data of mastery learning. Students will earn C's or higher or remediation will be provided.

Attendance- students will meet the criteria for attendance according to the Code of Conduct.

Behaviors- students will demonstrate compliance with Code of Conduct to earn review.
Establish 3 school-wide expectations that are defined, explicitly taught, and monitored for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Individualize student quarterly reviews of progress.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We are focused on increasing outcomes in attendance, academics, and behavior through a positive behavior interventions and supports tiered model that is flexible enough to support student, family, and community needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase from 30% to 35% in the Black/African-American student population returning to their zoned school based off of positive responses to interventions in place that address academic, attendance and behavior.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored through hourly and daily student point sheets, PLC meetings, monthly through staff and student leadership meetings, and quarterly student review meetings. Data is defined, documented, outlines outcomes, and evaluates effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We created a shared vision and approach to support and respond to student expectations. We established 3 positive school-wide expectations addressing social, emotional, and behavioral skills for student success. We utilize a continuum of recognition strategies to provide specific feedback and encourage student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide positive behavior interventions and supports is a multi-tiered system that improves attendance, behavior, and academic outcomes for student success while being flexible to student, family, and community needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set observable and measurable goal:

Academics- track data of mastery learning. Students will earn C's or higher or remediation will be provided.

Attendance- students will meet the criteria for attendance according to the Code of Conduct.

Behaviors- students will demonstrate compliance with Code of Conduct to earn review.
Establish 3 school-wide expectations that are defined, explicitly taught, and monitored for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Individualize student quarterly reviews of progress.

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We are focused on increasing outcomes in attendance, academics, and behavior through positive behavior interventions and support a tiered model that is flexible enough to support student, family, and community needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase from 20% to 25% in the students with disabilities population returning to their zoned school based on positive responses to interventions in place that address academic, attendance and behavior.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored through hourly and daily student point sheets, PLC meetings, monthly through staff and student leadership meetings, and quarterly student review meetings. Data is defined, documented, outlines outcomes, and evaluates effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We created a shared vision and approach to support and respond to student expectations. We established 3 positive school-wide expectations addressing social, emotional, and behavioral skills for student success. We utilize a continuum of recognition strategies to provide specific feedback and encourage student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide positive behavior interventions and support is a multi-tiered system that improves attendance, behavior, and academic outcomes for student success while being flexible to student, family, and community needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set observable and measurable goal:

Academics- track data of mastery learning. Students will earn C's or higher or remediation will be provided.

Attendance- students will meet the criteria for attendance according to the Code of Conduct.

Behaviors- students will demonstrate compliance with Code of Conduct to earn review.
Establish 3 school-wide expectations that are defined, explicitly taught, and monitored for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Individualize student quarterly reviews of progress.

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We are focused on increasing outcomes in attendance, academics, and behavior through positive behavior interventions and support a tiered model that is flexible enough to support student, family, and community needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase from 20% to 25% in the economically disadvantaged student population returning to their zoned school based on positive responses to interventions in place that address academic, attendance and behavior.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored through hourly and daily student point sheets, PLC meetings, monthly through staff and student leadership meetings, and quarterly student review meetings. Data is defined, documented, outlines outcomes, and evaluates effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We created a shared vision and approach to support and respond to student expectations. We established 3 positive school-wide expectations addressing social, emotional, and behavioral skills for student success. We utilize a continuum of recognition strategies to provide specific feedback and encourage student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide positive behavior interventions and support is a multi-tiered system that improves attendance, behavior, and academic outcomes for student success while being flexible to student, family, and community needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set observable and measurable goal:

Academics- track data of mastery learning. Students will earn C's or higher or remediation will be provided.

Attendance- students will meet the criteria for attendance according to the Code of Conduct.

Behaviors- students will demonstrate compliance with Code of Conduct to earn review.
 Establish 3 school-wide expectations that are defined, explicitly taught, and monitored for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Palmer (stephanie.palmer@myoneclay.net)

By When: Individualize student quarterly reviews of progress.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Funding is reviewed at the district level and allocations are assigned. We utilize our Champions ESE Support Facilitator to push into ELA classrooms. We added an Elevation Support Facilitator to support our ESE 12th graders working to complete graduation requirements. We have Elevation ELA and math teachers who support test prep needs of students. We utilize our Intensive Reading teacher in the Champions program targeting 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th grade students.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Charles E. Bennett Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Charles E. Bennett Elementary School

1 S OAKRIDGE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://ceb.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Charles E. Bennett Elementary, our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Charles E. Bennett Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown menu. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Strickland, Amanda	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and the vision of the school. Responsible for maintaining a school that has a safe and caring environment as well as quality instruction. Administers a balanced budget promotes a positive work environment, and involves community stakeholders and parents. Monitors data and provides professional development to improve practices for attendance, PBIS Tier 1 support, MTSS, and SWD inclusion models.
Hiers, Christina	Assistant Principal	Responsible for maintaining school wide discipline, interviewing and hiring teachers and staff, monitors attendance, textbook coordinator and testing coordinator. Promotes an environment that fosters learning and collegial atmosphere for teachers and staff.
Lilliard, Leigh	Math Coach	Responsible for Title 1 compliance and coaching teachers to improve math instruction and student academic achievement scores.
Fedorowich, Lori	Reading Coach	Responsible for Title 1 compliance and coaching teachers to improve reading instruction and student academic achievement scores.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

CEB's Leadership Team developed school improvement goals that included teacher, staff, and family input. CEB School Advisory Council met on August 21, 2023 to discuss and approve School Improvement Goals and Plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gaps. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

CEB Leadership Team will meet monthly to discuss progress toward school improvement goals with an emphasis on SWD and ELL data. The leadership team, in partnership with SAC will discuss data and develop action plans to promote continuous improvement toward school improvement goals.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level							
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Absent 10% or more days	35	36	19	31	28	23	26	0
One or more suspensions	1	4	8	11	9	12	22	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	37	21	29	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	31	31	34	31	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level							
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Students with two or more indicators	6	5	4	4	26	18	37	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level							
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	4	21	1	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level							
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Absent 10% or more days	0	37	29	22	26	22	27	0
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	3	12	5	4	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	19	32	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	27	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	16	19	19	32	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level							
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	1	15	12	16	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level								
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Retained Students: Current Year	1	10	5	6	15	12	19	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level								
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Absent 10% or more days	0	37	29	22	26	22	27	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	3	12	5	4	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	19	32	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	27	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	16	19	19	32	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level								
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	1	15	12	16	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level								
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Retained Students: Current Year	1	10	5	6	15	12	19	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019	
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District
ELA Achievement*	45			40			34	
ELA Learning Gains	56			54			47	
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43			51			50	
Math Achievement*	52			42			39	
Math Learning Gains	63			38			32	
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50			28			28	
Science Achievement*	31			47			31	
Social Studies Achievement*								
Middle School Acceleration								
Graduation Rate								
College and Career Acceleration								
ELP Progress	25			37			53	

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	41			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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
All Students	45	56	43	52	63	50	31				
SWD	20	46	43	26	52	46	14				
ELL	24	50	36	24	64						
AMI											
ASN											
BLK	33	54	44	37	60	53	25				
HSP	35	55	38	38	67	55	18				
MUL	69	83		77	83						
PAC											
WHT	51	54	40	60	62	47	37				
FRL	41	54	38	48	59	42	28				

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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
All Students	40	54	51	42	38	28	47				
SWD	18	49	50	22	36	30	41				
ELL	33			20							
AMI											
ASN											
BLK	27	55		22	34	38	22				
HSP	39	53		34	24						
MUL	46			42							
PAC											
WHT	44	53	60	50	43	22	62				
FRL	42	59	58	40	41	32	52				

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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
All Students	34	47	50	39	32	28	31				
SWD	18	48	64	18	26	34	19				
ELL	29	57		41	50						
AMI											
ASN											
BLK	22	46	50	22	29	40	0				
HSP	39	62		50	45		29				
MUL	15			42	60						
PAC											
WHT	37	46	52	41	29	21	40				
FRL	30	46	50	35	30	27	23				

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

All components showed low performance; however, fifth-grade science scored the lowest with 36 percent. The greatest contributing factor is teacher turnover during the school year. All fifth-grade science students did not have a consistent teacher during the school year. Consistent teacher turnover in grades third through sixth during the school year contributed to the lack of Tier 1 standards-based instruction in core subject areas. Differentiated small-group instruction was inconsistent in most classrooms due to teacher attendance and teacher turnover.

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

Math achievement showed the greatest decline with a 13-point drop. The factor that contributed to this decline is teacher turnover throughout the school year for third, fourth, and fifth grades. Student discipline and attendance were contributing factors to the decline in sixth-grade math achievement scores.

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 achievement scores had the greatest gap when compared to the state average due to teacher turnover throughout the school year and sections never having a permanent teacher throughout the school year.

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

All data components dropped and did not show an improvement. New actions were not taken by former administrators.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The EWS shows that CEB has a high percentage rate of students who miss more than 10% of the school year and suspensions due to discipline concerns. A high percentage of students have two or more EWS indicators.

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

Increase attendance by three percent.

Decrease discipline incidents by 25 percent.

Increase ELA achievement by five percentage points.

Increase math achievement by five percentage points.

Increase science achievement by 14 percentage points.

All of these priorities can be met with consistency in classroom teachers and differentiated small-group instruction.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If CEB provides high-quality instruction centered around the Science of Reading, then students will close their gaps in reading deficiencies and increase their reading achievement. Teachers and teaching assistants will receive professional development on LETRS training and micro-credentials to provide targeted reading differentiated instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be ELA. Using strategies and our action plan will increase our proficiency from 38% to 43% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student's progress will be monitored through SRA Corrective Reading Mastery Checks and Acadience quarterly checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI, or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- 1) Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction (ELA)
- 2) Systematic-explicit-recursive and cumulative phonics instruction (ELA)
- 3) Explicit vocabulary instruction (ELA)
- 4) Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (ELA)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1) Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction (Strong): The National Reading Panel found positive effects of phonemic awareness (PA) instruction on improving students' ability to apply phonemic awareness in their reading and spelling. Learning to manipulate phonemes in words helped the students learn to read.

Explicit, systematic phonological awareness instruction: strong evidence; https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf#page=28

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence; https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/adlit_pg_082608.pdf#page=22

2) Explicit, systematic phonics instruction: moderate impact; <https://evidenceforlearning.org.au/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/phonics/technical-appendix>

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence; https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/adlit_pg_082608.pdf#page=22

3) Explicit vocabulary instruction: strong evidence; <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/rmcfinal1.pdf>

4) Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction: strong evidence; <https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ss2/cre/q1/p03/>

*Students who have been explicitly taught multiple comprehension strategies demonstrate greater improvements in reading comprehension. However, students should be proficient with each strategy before they attempt to combine

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction (ELA) - Classroom teachers and assistants will provide small group instruction to explicitly and systematically teach phonological awareness and phonemic awareness. Teachers will use Wilson FUNdations daily for all kindergarten through second students. Student progress will be monitored through Acadience monthly checks.

Person Responsible: Amanda Strickland (amanda.strickland@myoneclay.net)

By When: Begin on August 14, 2023

Systematic-explicit-recursive and cumulative phonics instruction (ELA) - Classroom teachers and assistants will provide small group instruction to explicitly and systematically teach phonological and phonemic awareness. Teachers will use SRA Corrective Reading daily for all third through sixth-grade students.

Person Responsible: Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

By When: Will begin September 5, 2023

Explicit vocabulary instruction (ELA) - Classroom teachers will provide small group instruction to explicitly and systematically teach vocabulary. Teachers will use Spelling Morphology daily for all fourth through sixth grade students. Student progress will be monitored through teacher-created vocabulary assessments.

Person Responsible: Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

By When: Will begin September 5, 2023

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (ELA) - Classroom teachers will explicitly teach strategies to improve reading comprehension. Teachers will use SAVVAS daily for all kindergarten through sixth grade students. Student progress will be monitored through teacher-created comprehension assessments.

Person Responsible: Lori Fedorowich (lori.fedorowich@myoneclay.net)

By When: Teachers will begin on August 30, 2023

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

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

CEB teachers will provide high-quality instruction centered on Mathematic proficiency with the primary focus on number sense and operations. Students will close the gaps in their math deficiencies and increase their math achievement. Teachers and support staff will provide differentiated data-driven small group instruction to close gaps and increase achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math. Using strategies and our action plan will increase our proficiency from 39% to 44% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will create Common Formative Assessments developed during Professional Learning Communities that will be used to monitor student progress toward our goal. FAST, iReady, and Reflex data will also be used to monitor progress toward our goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Strickland (amanda.strickland@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI, or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- 1) Dedicated time for Math in School Schedule
- 2) Frequent Student Practice
- 3) Individual & Small Group Instruction
- 4) Progress Monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1) Dedicated time for Math in School Schedule - Tier 1, Strong

Source: Teaching Math to Young Children (NCEE 2014- 4055). https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/early_math_pg_111313.pdf

- 2) Frequent Student Practice - Tier 2, Promising; <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0040059912044004>

Source: Doabler, C. T., Cary, M. S., Jungjohann, K., Clarke, B., Fien, H., Baker, S., . . . Chard, D. (2012). Enhancing Mathematics Instruction for Students At Risk for Mathematics Disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 44(4), 48-58. Retrieved May 7, 2018.

- 3) Individual & Small Group Instruction - Tier 2, Promising

Source: Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement (NCEE 2009-012).

- 4) Tier 1, Strong; https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/early_math_pg_111313.pdf

Source: Teaching Math to Young Children (NCEE 2014- 4055).

Tier 3, Promising; https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/rTI_math_pg_042109.pdf

Source: Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools (NCEE 2009-4060).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Dedicated time for Math in School Schedule - CEB included dedicated differentiated small group instruction into the master schedule for all grade levels and included frequent student practice with iReady and Reflex math for math fact fluency.

Person Responsible: Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Frequent Student Practice - Students will use Reflex Math fluency program to increase their math fact fluency at least three times a week during small group math instructional time. Student progress will be monitored weekly and will be included in student data notebooks. Additional Chromebooks will be used for Reflex Math fluency program.

Person Responsible: Leigh Lillard (leigh.lillard@myoneclay.net)

By When: September 5, 2023

Individual & Small Group Instruction - Differentiated data-driven small group instruction will be provided by Title 1 full-time teachers, math teachers, and assistants.

Person Responsible: Leigh Lillard (leigh.lillard@myoneclay.net)

By When: September 5, 2023

Progress Monitoring - The teacher will create Common Formative Assessments developed during Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible: Leigh Lillard (leigh.lillard@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly beginning August 30, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If CEB provides high-quality instruction centered around Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), the students will feel a part of the safe and inclusive learning environment which will decrease unwanted behaviors and increase academic achievement. Teachers and teaching assistants will receive professional development on Tier 1 expectations and acknowledge all students positively.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase time on task, and student engagement and decrease discipline referrals from 398 to 300 by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

PBIS team and administrators will weekly analyze discipline, attendance, and PBIS Tier 1 data to determine if students are being responsible, innovative, confident, engaged, and reflective.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Strickland (amanda.strickland@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI, or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS Supporting and Responding to Students' Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Needs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The effectiveness of these practices are maximized when: practices are implemented within a schoolwide MTSS framework, such as positive behavioral interventions and supports. The Supporting and Responding To Students' Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Needs: Evidence-Based Practices for Educators will be implemented schoolwide. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UpnHEiSk-QRpMBmk_uhTuuoYqQr/view

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers and staff will receive professional development and coaching on classroom management, PBIS, and how to positively recognize students for wanted behaviors.

Person Responsible: Amanda Strickland (amanda.strickland@myoneclay.net)

By When: October 2023

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If CEB provides high-quality instruction using high leverage practices for inclusion classrooms then students will increase their reading and math achievement. Teachers and teaching assistants will receive professional development on differentiated small group instruction and using high leverage practices for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Currently, our students with disabilities are at 15% proficient in ELA and 19% proficient in Math. Using strategies and an action plan we will increase our students with disabilities proficiency to 30% in ELA to 40% in Math by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Exceptional Student Education teachers will monitor students' progress by collecting weekly data to support their Individual Education Plan goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI, or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide focused, intensive small-group interventions to SWD. Explicit, direct instruction should be the primary means of instructional delivery to improve reading comprehension outcomes.

<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/20074011.pdf#page=27>

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

ESE and General Education teachers will receive professional development and coaching cycles to improve differentiated small group instruction for our students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Amanda Strickland (amanda.strickland@myoneclay.net)

By When: October 2023

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If CEB provides high-quality instruction to ensure that English Language Learners have a repetition of comprehensible language that's related to grade-level instruction. Teachers and teaching assistants will receive professional development in differentiated small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Currently, our ELL students are at 8% proficient in ELA and 17% proficient in Math. Using strategies and our action plan we will increase our ELL proficiency from 20% in ELA and 30% in Math by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

CEB's ELL paraprofessional will weekly monitor students' progress in the English language. Our Guidance Counselor and teachers will create formative assessments for our ELL students to determine mastery of the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Strickland (amanda.strickland@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI, or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1) Systematic, direct-explicit instruction

2) Small group instruction; <https://www.google.com/url?q=https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/20074011.pdf%23page%3D27&sa=D&source=docs&ust=1693094558998874&usg=AOvVaw0RLPjGAhQu7UQHXX>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction creates best reading comprehension outcomes. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/adlit_pg_082608.pdf#page=22

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers and assistants will receive professional development and coaching to provide students with strategies to increase the repetition of comprehensible language that's related to grade-level instruction and monitor students' progress in language acquisition.

Person Responsible: Amanda Strickland (amanda.strickland@myoneclay.net)

By When: November 2023

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 based on 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

CEB teachers will provide explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction to provide students with foundational reading skills to increase their reading academic achievement.

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

CEB teachers will provide systematic, explicit, recursive, and cumulative phonics instruction to provide students with foundational reading skills and close reading deficits to increase their reading academic achievement.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Using Lexia Baseline data, CEB students are struggling with foundational skills.

At the beginning of the school year, 84 percent of our Kindergarteners are working below grade level. By the end of the school year, 75 percent of our Kindergarteners will be on grade level.

At the beginning of the school year, 84 percent of our first graders are working below grade level. By the end of the school year, 75 percent of our first graders will be on grade level.

At the beginning of the school year, 80 percent of our second graders are working below grade level. By the end of the school year, 75 percent of our second graders will be on grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

At the beginning of the school year, 93 percent of our third graders are working below grade level. By the end of the school year, 75 percent of our third graders will be on grade level.

At the beginning of the school year, 80 percent of our fourth graders are working below grade level. By the end of school year, 75 percent of our fourth graders will be on grade level.

At the beginning of the school year, 82 percent of our fifth graders are working below grade level. By the end of school year, 75 percent of our fifth graders will be on grade level.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The areas of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring systems such as SRA Mastery Tests, FUNdations assessments, Acadience, and FAST data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hiers, Christina, christina.hiers@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each area 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?

1) Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction (ELA) - Classroom teachers, Title 1 teachers, and paraprofessionals will provide small group instruction to explicitly and systematically teach phonological awareness and phonemic awareness. Teachers will use Wilson FUNdations daily for all kindergarten through second students. Student progress will be monitored through Acadience monthly checks. FAST data will be analyzed after each assessment.

2) Systematic-explicit-recursive and cumulative phonics instruction (ELA) - Classroom teachers, Title 1 teachers, paraprofessionals will provide small group instruction to explicitly and systematically teach phonological and phonemic awareness. Teachers will use SRA Corrective Reading daily for all third through sixth grade students. Student progress will be monitored through SRA Mastery Assessments and Acadience quarterly checks. FAST data will be analyzed after each assessment.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction (Strong): The National Reading Panel found positive effects of phonemic awareness (PA) instruction on improving students' ability to apply phonemic awareness in their reading and spelling. Learning to manipulate phonemes in words helped the students learn to read.

Explicit, systematic phonological awareness instruction: strong evidence; https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf#page=28

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence; https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/adlit_pg_082608.pdf#page=22

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 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible Monitoring
Teachers and staff will receive professional development centered on the Science of Reading to have a better understanding of how to teach and assess students who are struggling to read at grade level.	Strickland, Amanda, amanda.strickland@myoneclay.org
CEB created a Literacy Leadership Council to analyze data and progress toward RAISE and SIP goals. The Literacy Leadership Council will meet monthly and will also receive professional development on the CERP.	Hiers, Christina, christina.hiers@myoneclay.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provide in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is shared with stakeholders through quarterly School Advisory Council meetings, Title 1 Annual Meeting newsletters, and the school's webpage (<https://ceb.myoneclay.net/title-1-resources>).

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116)

CEB plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and the community by ensuring that all stakeholders are a part of our students' academic experience. Stakeholders will receive weekly newsletters, Facebook posts, robo-calls, and flyers for school events such as Back to School Kickoff, Cambridge Night, Math Game Night, Learning with the Library, and many others. (<https://ceb.myoneclay.net/title-1-resources>)

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

CEB increased the amount of quality learning time in the master schedule with an emphasis on third and fifth grade. Teachers have also received professional development to increase bell-to-bell teaching strategies and decrease classroom instruction due to unwanted behaviors.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1114(b)(5) (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The SIP has been developed to coordinate and integrate Title 1 programs, Exceptional Student Education, and English Language Learners. Using Title 1 funds, additional teachers and assistants were hired to support differentiated student group instruction to increase academic achievement for our ESSA groups and all students.

Clay County Schools

Clay Charter Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Clay Charter Academy

1417 RED APPLE RD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://claycharter.org/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a safe and nurturing K-8 community where students develop integrity and accountability to reach their fullest potential. Students will foster a love of learning through rigorous and engaging curriculum within a school culture that promotes diversity and inclusion, celebrates family, allows them to become college and career ready and grow into productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reaching new heights with every flight. Eagles soar together.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gifford, Brian	Principal	Clay Charter Academy has a leadership team consisting of the principal, assistant principal, 2 CRTs, and the dean that work collaboratively to make school based decisions based on data. The principal oversees all school operations and completes instructional evaluation and feedback along with PD based on strategic goals and schoolwide needs identified by the leadership team.
Caldwell, Heather	Assistant Principal	Clay Charter Academy has a leadership team consisting of the principal, assistant principal, 2 CRTs, and the dean that work collaboratively to make school based decisions based on data. The assistant principal oversees scheduling, state testing, special populations and also completes regular instructional evaluation and feedback along with PD trainings based on strategic goals and schoolwide needs identified by the leadership team.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School leadership team including Principal, assistant principal, 2 CRTs, Dean along with CSUSA area 5 deputy director and area 5 curriculum specialist met with the Clay county district team due to being identified as a ATSI school. The areas identified included two subgroups based on data from the 21-22 school year. The two identified subgroups below 41 percentile were students with disabilities at 26 and English language learners at 38. Students with disabilities fell below 41 3 years and below 32 1 year. English language learners fell below 41 1 year. These subgroups will be the focus of our SIP this year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will be monitored quarterly through assessment data review, walkthroughs and weekly grade level PLCs.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	7%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	21	14	12	13	17	3	17	3	3	103
One or more suspensions	5	0	0	2	4	7	5	6	6	35
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	1	3	0	2	2	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	4	11	8	16	14	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	2	2	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	4	11	12	22	5	58

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	5	6	13	9	14	14	11	75

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	22	22	13	8	21	11	33	9	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	1	4	1	5	6	21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	12	7	4	3	4	8	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	2	2	6	4	2	1	9	0	4	30
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	24	13	22	18	19	96
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	15	32	25	15	22	128
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	24	13	22	18	19	96

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	6	10	19	9	13	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	3	1	0	0	7	1	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52			56			58		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	50			48			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31			38			69		
Math Achievement*	49			55			65		
Math Learning Gains	45			40			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45			32			46		
Science Achievement*	46			35			59		
Social Studies Achievement*	75			79			79		
Middle School Acceleration	76			47			80		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress							39		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL				

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	50	31	49	45	45	46	75	76			
SWD	20	33	20	19	35	32	15	36				
ELL	29	50	36	32	47	45	29					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	45	21	41	39	38	35	61	60			
HSP	49	51	43	47	53	40	44	79	71			
MUL	56			53								
PAC												
WHT	60	54	33	56	43	57	52	79	83			
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	48	38	55	40	32	35	79	47			
SWD	26	24	23	30	26	27	0	46				
ELL	26	45		32	36							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	45	34	46	39	38	24	65	38			
HSP	55	46	33	50	34	21	26	67	53			
MUL	50	43		63	36							
PAC												
WHT	65	52	57	65	46	36	61	100	40			
FRL	50	31		57	36							

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	58	62	69	65	62	46	59	79	80			39
SWD	16	44	53	33	38	26	30	46				
ELL	33	67		50	67							39
AMI												
ASN	73			73								
BLK	49	60	67	55	66	45	21	61				
HSP	66	65	73	66	59	46	44	93				33
MUL	64			55								
PAC												
WHT	56	61	68	69	60	39	71	82				
FRL	52	56	59	51	53	44	36	86				30

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

From the 21-22 school year data, the students with disabilities subgroup performed the lowest; specifically in Science achievement 15%, Math achievement 19% and ELA achievement 20%. Our ELL subgroup performed the lowest in ELA achievement 29% and Science achievement 29%. One explanation for the poor performance with these subgroups could be the ESE teachers not having consistent, research based resources to more effectively assist students with identified learning gaps. Other possible explanations include high teacher turnover and a leadership change within the school.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year from the SWD subgroup includes; SWD ELA Achievement dropped from 26% to 20%, SWD Math Achievement dropped from 30% to 19%, SWD SS Achievement dropped from 46% to 36%. For the ELL subgroup, all recorded scores increased from the prior school year. One explanation for the poor performance with these subgroups could be the ESE teachers not having consistent, research based resources to more effectively assist students with identified learning gaps. Other possible explanations include high teacher turnover and a leadership change within the school.

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.

20% of SWD Lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA as compared with the state average of 33.8% (13.8% gap). One explanation for the poor performance with these subgroups could be the ESE teachers not having consistent, research based resources to more effectively assist students with identified learning gaps. Other possible explanations include high teacher turnover and a leadership change within the school.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement included SWD ELA learning gains which improved 9 points from 24 to 33 and SWD Math learning gains which also improved 9 points from 26 to 35. The ELL subgroup improved in all areas with the biggest gain being an 11 point increase in math learning gains from 36 to 45. This can be contributed to a strong tier 1 instructional program which allowed students to show growth even though their overall achievement was low.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance was a big issue across the board which can greatly affect student outcomes. 103 students missed 10% or more school days last year. Also, 35 students were suspended last year and missing school for discipline purposes affects learning as well.

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

1. Increase ELA academic achievement of our students with disabilities subgroup.
2. Increase ELA achievement for our English language learners subgroup.
3. Implement effective PBIS program to decrease suspensions
4. Implement effective attendance team to monitor and address attendance concerns consistently

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increasing ELA achievement for students with disabilities. Increasing reading proficiency will positively impact all subject areas for students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities will increase ELA achievement to 32% from 20% by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students with disabilities data will be reviewed regularly in weekly PLC meetings along with quarterly leadership data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ESE teachers will use research based interventions that align with their students' identified learning gaps. Students will be regularly assessed and interventions adjusted based on performance data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research based interventions will be more effective at assisting students with bridging identified gaps. More consistent monitoring will ensure specific needs and adjustments are made in a timely manner.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Research based interventions available will be reviewed and additional materials purchased based on need.

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: September 15, 2023

ESE teachers will meet in regular weekly PLCs to review data from interventions and make changes accordingly.

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: Each month through April, starting September 5, 2023.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase ELA achievement for english language learners. If we can increase overall reading achievement, those skills will also positively impact performance in all subject areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

English language learners will increase ELA achievement to 35% from 29% by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

English language learners achievement data will be reviewed in weekly PLC meetings as well as quarterly leadership data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ELL coordinator will work with teachers regularly to ensure that resources and supports are working effectively for their students and adjust supports if needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the past, ELL plans and accommodations were just given to teachers with no assessment of effectiveness. With closer monitoring and adjusting, students will be ensured to get the level of support that they need.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Review subgroup data (NWEA & FAST PM1) as leadership team by September 18, 2023. Make suggestions to guide ELL plans and supports based on data.

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: by September 18, 2023

Meet with grade level teams in weekly PLCs with at least once a month reviews of subgroup data to guide any needed changes to ELL supports

Person Responsible: Heather Caldwell (hcaldwell@claycharter.org)

By When: Each month through April, beginning October 2, 2023.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Decrease student suspensions by implementing an effective PBIS program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Implement effective PBIS program to consistently recognize and reward behavior expectations and decrease student suspensions from 35 to 20 or less by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Established PBIS committee will meet monthly to discuss trends and review behavioral data. They will problem solve and plan recognition and reward activities to increase positive school culture for students and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Gifford (bgifford@claycharter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Unified classroom behavior support was purchased by the school to allow each teacher to actively recognize students exhibiting schoolwide behavior expectations and to document any behavior incidents so that trends can be identified and acted upon. Character Counts was also purchased to provide weekly character lessons to develop character values in all students as well as to recognize students in displaying the 6 pillars of character that align with the schoolwide SOAR expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing a positive school culture and recognizing and rewarding students for exhibiting behavior expectations will reduce the amount of off task and disruptive behaviors thereby reducing suspensions and time out of school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Implement and roll out training to teachers on the new PBIS systems

Person Responsible: Brian Gifford (bgifford@claycharter.org)

By When: by October 15, 2023.

Meet with grade level teams (Admin, Student Support Coordinator and Dean) monthly to review behavior trends and share resources and ideas related to recognizing students and problem solving issues.

Person Responsible: Brian Gifford (bgifford@claycharter.org)

By When: Monthly beginning in September through April 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Clay Charter Academy will use title IV funds to purchase Unified Classroom Behavior Support and the Character Counts program as well as student rewards to support our PBIS school goals this school year.

CCA will also use ESSER 3 funds to purchase any additional tier 2 and tier 3 research based interventions that our students with disabilities or English language learners may need in accordance with our ATSI SIP goals.

Clay County Schools

Clay High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Clay High School

2025 FL-16, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://chs.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Clay High School, in conjunction with the School District of Clay County, is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a quality education and motivate students to develop and excel in academics, technology, and social interaction in a caring and safe environment that fosters responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Clay High School and the School District of Clay County to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Halter, Jen	Principal	Educational leader of the school who oversees all areas of Clay High School. Assigned to oversee 9th & 10th grade English/Language Arts, Algebra 1, Geometry, and all new teachers to Clay High School.
King, Bonnie	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership to the Intensive Reading, math, AICE, and ESE departments as well as manage the day-to-day operations of the school.
Lewis, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Oversees career and technical education programs, manages the day-to-day operations of the school, and works with students to improve classroom climate and culture.
Burghart, Joshua	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership to 11th & 12th grade ELA, social studies, science, and physical education. Mr. Burghart oversees PBIS, climate, and culture. He also helps manage the day-to-day running of the school.
Horn, Susan	School Counselor	Guidance department head. Works with guidance team and others to support students' academic success. Primary person responsible for coordinating socialemotional learning activities during the school day.
Dillon, Theresa	SAC Member	SAC Chairperson Also a math teacher who is responsible for providing instructional support to students in math.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Clay High's SAC team involved a variety of stakeholders at that have helped make the SIP and will continue monitoring the SIP throughout the school year. Dr. Halter, Clay High's principal, and Mr. Burghart, Clay High's assistant principal are part of the SAC and represent the school's leadership team. Ms. Horne represents the teachers and school staff. Ms. Dillon represents the parents of students that attend Clay High. We have students from the 11th and 12th grades that represent the student body at Clay High. Stacey Reape, the owner of Tucker's Farm House, is not officially part of the SAC, but she is consulted to get business partners' input on Clay High's SIP and consults on other important decisions that the SAC makes throughout the year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Clay High's SIP will be monitored in a variety of ways. We will utilize our weekly PLCs to create rigorous common assessments, analyze data trends, and make plans for remediation where necessary. Specifically, we will look at our subgroups of SWD and ELL are performing to see if we are closing the performance gap. Also, administrators will be present at PLCs and they will seek feedback from members of the PLC. The administration team will conduct walkthroughs and provide constructive feedback on instructional practices. Students will take ownership of their own data through data chats that they hold with their teacher. Dr. Halter and Mr. Burghart will monitor Data results and be in communication on possible next steps throughout the year. We will place an emphasis on the ELL and SWD data.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47			53			58		
ELA Learning Gains	43			48			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	27			34			41		
Math Achievement*	36			36			50		
Math Learning Gains	37			26			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34			31			36		
Science Achievement*	64			70			71		
Social Studies Achievement*	79			76			77		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	95			94			94		
College and Career Acceleration	57			49			61		
ELP Progress	50			54			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	95

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL	24	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	52			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	43	27	36	37	34	64	79		95	57	50
SWD	19	25	18	12	26	31	36	58		87	24	
ELL	0	35	43	7	33		0					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	30	23	16	32	42	45	67		97	24	
HSP	38	44	42	36	40	40	57	69		100	56	50
MUL	41	31					70	92				
PAC												
WHT	52	45	24	40	38	27	68	83		94	62	
FRL	30	35	27	25	34	40	51	68		93	46	25

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	53	48	34	36	26	31	70	76		94	49	54
SWD	20	40	41	19	27	33	31	56		89	27	
ELL	0	20	23	19	29					61	27	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	45	40	18	28	35	53	54		91	31	
HSP	40	44	39	31	18	18	51	75		89	38	56
MUL	64	63		45	35			73				
PAC												
WHT	58	49	32	40	26	33	76	78		94	52	
FRL	40	45	36	29	22	30	60	65		88	38	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	58	47	41	50	42	36	71	77		94	61	50
SWD	27	41	41	21	35	37	43	48		90	34	
ELL	25	40		13	15							50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	39	37	30	34	22	42	60		96	35	
HSP	62	54	43	46	30	27	67	63		97	46	46
MUL	42	46		41	32		73	80				
PAC												
WHT	61	48	41	54	44	41	76	81		94	68	
FRL	46	43	41	40	36	29	62	77		88	47	57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA learning gains. ELA learning gains have been an issue for Clay High for years. Improving it will help Clay High continue its upward projections for ELA scores. In 2021 ELA learning gains were 48% and in 2022 they were 43%. 2023 did not measure this area, but it is a historical data trend that needs to be addressed. Furthermore, our ELL population received a 0% in ELA achievement. We are switching our ELL model to include push-in from ESOL aids and weekly monitoring of progress.

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

U.S. History EOC scores dropped 9% from the previous year. In 2022, Clay High had a 79% proficiency rate for our U.S. History EOC scores. In 2023, Clay High dropped to a 70% proficiency rate. This drop occurred for a few reasons. The testing class has struggled in the past in the FSA ELA state test. Their testing results saw an 11% decrease on the 9th-grade ELA scores during their freshman year and they saw an 11% decrease in 10th-grade ELA scores during their sophomore year. We needed to concentrate on the lower quartile reading gains for these students. If we did, then the drop would not have been as large because the U.S. History EOC is a content area test that requires high-level reading skills.

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.

Clay High has two subgroups that are below the 41% threshold. ELL received a zero percent on ELA achievement. After reviewing our ELL program, we have switched to a push-in model with weekly monitoring to help students see improvement in this area.

SWD students saw a nineteen percent on ELA achievement and a twelve percent on Math achievement. To fix this data gap, Clay High was switched to a push-in model for these tested areas. Support facilitators have made a schedule and are pushing into tested subject areas in ELA and math. Support facilitators co-teach with the teachers when they push-in classrooms. During push-in, they are able to pull small groups and remediate students who are in need of remediation. They are also able to check for understanding over the topics being taught for that day.

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

Algebra I EOC scores jumped by 28%. Last year, Clay's Algebra I EOC scores showed a 55% proficiency rate. The math department used learning targets based on state standards, rigorous PLCs that were based on data analysis, common assessments and used remediation plans to help students achieve learning gains.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

EWS reports K-8 data. Clay High School is a 9-12 school.

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

- 1) ELA learning gains with ELL focus
- 2) SWD learning gains in math and ELA
- 4) Average daily attendance
- 5) U.S. History EOC scores

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Learning Gains

Measurable Outcome:

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

Clay High had a 35% for ELL ELA learning gains. On the 2024 FAST test will see a 10% increase in learning gains for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Clay High will monitor the progress of our ELL students in a variety of ways. We will have weekly push-in from our ELL aids. They will monitor progress and complete progress checks with students. We will also monitor progress on the PM test throughout the year and provide remediation opportunities to help students improve in areas in which they are struggling.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Burghart (joshua.burghart@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will use Rosetta Stone and are required to complete 50-60 minutes weekly on the program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the Rosetta Stone time, students will be immersed in English Language acquisition. This program is aimed to help improve English language proficiency and reading comprehension.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

To get a 10% increase in learning gains on the ELA FAST test for our ELL learners, Clay will have weekly push-in from our ELL aids. They will monitor progress and complete progress checks with students. We will also monitor progress on the PM test throughout the year and provide remediation opportunities to help students improve in areas in which they are struggling.

Person Responsible: Joshua Burghart (joshua.burghart@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will monitor progress quarterly and will see the 10% increase by the 2023-2024 ELA FAST test in the spring.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

U.S. History scores dropped by 9% in 2023. In 2022, the proficiency rate for Clay High's U.S. History scores was 79%. In 2023, the proficiency rate dropped to 70%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For next year's U.S. History EOC, Clay High will implement department-wide systems that will help raise U.S. History EOC scores by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Clay High will monitor the progress of each student by examining common assessment data, using progress monitoring tests each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To improve instruction, there needs to be data collection and data plans to help students who need extra support. Teachers will use PLCs to make common assessments, use data dialogs to examine data trends from common assessments and progress monitoring tests, have data chats with students to monitor progress, and implement remediation plans for students that are needing extra support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The best way to improve student outcomes is to monitor their progression through data. This will allow teachers to identify which students are excelling and need enrichment opportunities. It also allows teachers to identify students that need remediation in certain areas that show lower data trends. These areas can be addressed by the teacher, which will help raise proficiency rates for students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

To achieve a 5% increase on the U.S History EOC, teachers will use PLCs to make common assessments, use data dialogs to examine data trends from common assessments and progress monitoring tests, have data chats with students to monitor progress, and implement remediation plans for students that are needing extra support.

Person Responsible: Joshua Burghart (joshua.burghart@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will monitor the progress of these goals quarterly and we will see a 5% increase by the U.S. History EOC in May 2024.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

One of the greatest factors of student success is attendance. Clay High has an average daily attendance of 84.8%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Clay High will implement a comprehensive PBIS plan to help raise student average daily attendance by 2% for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The PBIS team will meet monthly and monitor Clay High's average daily attendance rates. Students that are showing early warning signs of attendance issues will be placed in the Power 50 program and they will be monitored weekly until their attendance improves.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The PBIS team will implement reward-based programs. The PBIS team will monitor each class's attendance rates monthly. The Blue Devil Cup will have an average daily attendance component to it, the Power 50 program will monitor our habitual absentee students, and the Blue Devil Distinction program will allow individual teachers to reward students for their improvement in attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to know that attendance in school is an important part of being successful. The PBIS programs that are being described will help motivate students to come to school and provide incentives for being present daily.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

To achieve a 2% increase in average daily attendance, we will monitor student attendance rates monthly. Students who are showing early warning signs of attendance issues will be placed in the Power 50 program and they will be monitored weekly until their attendance improves. Students will also receive Blue Devil Distinctions for improved attendance in individual classrooms. They will receive a certificate, candy, and be placed into a drawing for bigger prizes.

Person Responsible: Joshua Burghart (joshua.burghart@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will monitor the average daily attendance every month and we will see the average daily attendance increase by 2% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SWD students only obtained a 25% in ELA learning gains and a 26% in math learning gains. To move this subgroup beyond the 41% threshold, we will need to improve this area to help students see greater success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Clay High aims to improve learning gains in the area of ELA and Math for our SWD population. On the FAST test, we aim to see a 5% increase in learning gains for ELA and Math for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take progress monitoring tests throughout the school year. Support facilitators and content teachers will track the progress of students throughout the year. During PLCs remediation plans will be put in place to help students achieve proficiency in areas that they are struggling in. We will use the push-in model for our support facilitators to help give extra support to students who are struggling in certain areas. Students will also receive individual data chats with their teacher or support facilitator to help students understand areas of needed improvement and go over the plan on how they will advance in these areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bonnie King (bonnie.king@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

At Clay High, we use the push-in model to help students receive small groups in a standard classroom. With the push-in model, it allows support facilitators to operate small groups to give small-group instruction to students that need extra support. Having two teachers present in the classroom ensures that students are being given the attention they need to help see improvement in areas that they are currently needing to see improvement in.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FIN supports the push-in model. According to one of FIN's articles, the push-in model that creates collaborative teaching classrooms has attributed to increases in AYP. In Hillsborough County during 2024-2025 school year schools that used the push-in model outperformed schools that did not use push-in by 18% in AYP.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

To achieve a 5% increase on the FAST test in ELA and Math for students with disabilities, support facilitators and content teachers will track the progress of students throughout the year. During PLCs remediation plans will be put in place to help students achieve proficiency in areas that they are struggling in. We will use the push-in model for our support facilitators to help give extra support to students who are struggling in certain areas. Students will also receive individual data chats with their teacher or support facilitator to help students understand areas of needed improvement and go over the plan on how they will advance in these areas.

Person Responsible: Bonnie King (bonnie.king@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will monitor students by quarter and we will see a 5% increase by the 2023-2024 FAST test for ELA and Math.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The Clay High SAC team will review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. The team will meet every quarter and examine spending. Any areas of concern will be addressed and extra funding will be provided where necessary.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment:	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Clay Hill Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Clay Hill Elementary School

6345 COUNTY ROAD 218, Jacksonville, FL 32234

<http://che.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clay Hill Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and technologically advanced society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Reed, Adele	Principal	The function of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction for all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-2 Foundational Skills Assessment or alternative, 5th-grade Performance Matters benchmark science assessments (and other locally-created common assessments), and formal assessments such as the FSA or SAT-10. The Principal is a participant in the meeting. The Assistant Principal will attend the meetings in a support role for the Principal. The reading committee chairperson may provide effective interventions for the Tier 1, 2, or 3 instructional needs, as does the math committee chairperson in order to make recommendations for Math. The Intervention Team Facilitator is present to help ensure that the district's MTSS plan is followed. Lead teachers sometimes serve on the SBLT as a liaison to other teachers in their grade/content area grouping
Libretto, Lara	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will serve in a support role for the Principal.
Loper, Stephanie	Other	Provides input and guidance to promote student achievement by collaborating with teachers and parents regarding student intervention and progress monitoring data.
Medina, Renee	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Dupont, DeeAnn	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Pittman, Meredith		As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Ristad, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fehrs, Amy	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Dechman, Janet	Teacher, ESE	As a grade level team leader, focus will be on improving student achievement by: modeling and supporting effective instructional practices; data analysis practices; parent communication; overseeing best practices among team members through the use of profession learning communities (PLCs).
Stevens, Candice	Other	Offers support with data analysis and collegial learning, communication, and oversight. Provides reading instruction to challenged readers identified by Florida Standards Assessment Test (FAST) ELA scores.
Lowans, Allyson	Other	Improve student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice with technology and data systems (Synergy, iReady, Lexia, etc.), promote collegial learning and communication (FB, Instagram, etc.) with and among stakeholders. Improve student achievement in reading by ensuring that school practices, including professional development, instruction, curriculum, and assessment, align with state statute.
Caren, Lori	Teacher, K-12	
Byers, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders were involved in gathering input for the development of the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan using the data and analysis from classroom walkthroughs, student performance on state-wide testing, student performance on district-wide progress monitoring, climate and culture surveys, attendance records, Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) reports for student discipline.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored, with shared results to stakeholders, quarterly. Information will be transmitted in the Principal's parent newsletter, SAC Committee, and shared with lead teachers to disseminate information among grade level teams. The Curriculum Council and School Leadership Team will meet quarterly as well to review achievement, analyze data, and revise the SIP is needed to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	9%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	2	7	3	14	0	0	36
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	6	12	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	9	11	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	13

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	17	16	13	19	9	13	9	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	7	7	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	13	4	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	3	8	8	0	0	23

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	17	16	13	19	9	13	9	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	7	7	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	13	4	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	3	8	8	0	0	23

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61			51			60		
ELA Learning Gains	60			43			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69			35			49		
Math Achievement*	61			56			62		
Math Learning Gains	63			40			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58			50			41		
Science Achievement*	41			67			70		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK				
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	59			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	60	69	61	63	58	41					
SWD	35	46	59	39	50	50	15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	45			55								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	58	70	62	62	55	39					
FRL	61	68	70	56	62	62	35					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	43	35	56	40	50	67					
SWD	37	35	38	46	33		53					
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52	43	33	56	38	47	67					
FRL	43	33	23	48	39	43	58					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	62	49	62	67	41	70					
SWD	41	46	42	42	53	38	60					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62	63	50	63	66	39	69					
FRL	59	63	55	55	63	39	64					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Overall math achievement showed the lowest performance based on 2023 Spring FAST data scoring 54% proficient rate. Contributing factors for this decline may include high teacher turnover rate to staff population throughout the course of the school year. The ripple effect of this was lack of qualified, certified Florida educators providing instruction.

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

Overall math achievement was also the area of greatest decline from the 2022 school year based on the Spring 2023 Spring FAST proficiency decreased from 61% down to 54%. Contributing factors for this decline may include high teacher turnover rate to staff population throughout the course of the school year. The ripple effect of this was lack of qualified, certified Florida educators providing instruction. Long term substitute teachers who were placed in the abandoned posts also were not afforded the professional development opportunities that went along with the district wide adopted math curriculum aligned with the Florida Best Standards.

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.

Overall math achievement was also the area of greatest decline from the 2022 school year based on the Spring 2023 Spring FAST proficiency decreased from 61% down to 54%. Contributing factors for this decline may include high teacher turnover rate to staff population throughout the course of the school year. The ripple effect of this was lack of qualified, certified Florida educators providing instruction. Long term substitute teachers who were placed in the abandoned posts also were not afforded the professional development opportunities that went along with the district wide adopted math curriculum aligned with the Florida Best Standards.

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

Overall Science achievement had the most improvement when compared to the state average. Clay Hill Elementary proficiency rate was 64% compared to the state average of 51%. Contributing factors to the closing of this gap includes the use of high yield instructional strategies that focus on teaching the Florida BEST Standards. Clay Hill Elementary has also improved its systems of targeting student needs through the analysis of data, as well as more consistent progress monitoring to ensure that learning is accelerated. Teachers will utilize Learning Targets, Checks for Understanding, and Instruction Aligned to Assessment Results to improve teaching and learning. Rigorous/On-Level Content, explicit engagement strategies (i.e., Think-Pair-Share, CFU's, collaboration, etc.), and academic ownership (i.e., student data analysis, goal setting, & tracking, parent engagement in data monitoring and action steps) were employed to accelerate learning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data, two areas of concerns involve SWD. In the areas of mathematics and ELA, our SWD subgroup for fifth grade ELA was only 11%, and our SWD subgroup for third grade math was 37%.

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

Clay Hill Elementary School's top three highest priorities for the upcoming school year are: to increase proficiency in mathematical thinking and reasoning, to increase proficiency in reading comprehension, to focus on positive culture and environment.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on students Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Math 2022-2023 scores, proficiency in mathematical thinking and reasoning is a crucial area of focus. Clay Hill Elementary scores were 54%, lower than the state's 56% proficiency rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using evidence based strategies we will increase our overall proficiency in mathematical thinking and reasoning from 54% to 60% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

All teachers will use data to identify student areas of need in math and develop and deliver daily differentiated small group as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, and student work analysis, and data chats/professional learning communities (PLCs). Substitutes will be provided for teachers during these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based interventions will be implemented for this area of focus: small group math instruction; frequent student practice, visual representations with programs such as i-Ready Math, teaching modeling using interactive monitors, frequent progress monitoring assessments using Eureka Squared content to check for mastery levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement an on-level curriculum (Eureka Squared) and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards in conjunction with high impact learning strategies, learning acceleration may begin and learning gains will be made by all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will be trained on new math curriculum. Small group instruction will be utilized in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of 2023-2024 School Year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on students Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA 2022-2023 scores, proficiency in reading comprehension is a crucial area of focus. While Clay Hill Elementary scored above the state's 50% proficiency rate at 56%, we still decreased in proficiency from the 2021-2022 school year down from 61% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through the practice of evidence based, direct explicit instruction, Clay Hill Elementary will increase our overall proficiency on the FAST ELA 2023-2024 from 56% to 61% by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

All teachers will use data to identify student areas of need in the five components of reading and develop and deliver daily differentiated small group as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, and student work analysis, and data chats/professional learning communities (PLCs). Substitutes will be provided for teachers during these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All teachers will utilize the gradual release process to model, guide, and provide application opportunity in grade appropriate comprehension strategies as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walk throughs and student work analysis, and professional learning communities (PLCs).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All teachers will implement an on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards in conjunction with high impact learning strategies, learning acceleration and learning gains will be made by all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Evidence-based strategies that will be employed to achieve our goals for improvement include:

Explicit vocabulary instruction,

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, After) such as activating prior knowledge,

Generating questions,

Monitoring comprehension,
Identifying main idea,
Paraphrasing and summarizing,
Small-Group Instruction based on data to target specific needs of student groups

Person Responsible: Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Clay Hill Elementary is focusing on fostering positive peer relationships.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This area of focus was based on data from Clay Hill Elementary's school wide 2023 Annual School Climate and Culture Survey. By the 2024 Annual School Climate and Culture Survey, we will increase the percentage of students who report positive peer relations from 41.80% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Use the PBIS rewards program to enable us to monitor the distribution of PBIS points, and the specific life skills at which students are most and least proficient, better allowing us to target our PD focus with staff and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The PBIS Team will develop and cross train on Mindsets lessons for implementation school wide. All staff will deepen knowledge of effective PBIS strategies to increase rates of acknowledgement and reinforcement of positive behaviors among students as evidenced by PBIS Rewards data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement the adopted 7 Mindsets curriculum and PBIS strategies with fidelity, an increase in positive behaviors among students should be seen, ensuring that all students feel respected and safe.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Train newly hired staff and faculty in the 7 Mindsets.
2. Provide PBIS school year kick off including new goal sets, student rewards, etc...

Person Responsible: Adele Reed (adele.reed@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of the first quarter.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Based on PM3 STAR data from 2023, the percent of students in grades K-3 who were scoring below "At or Above Proficiency" (below 41st percentile) was:

Kindergarten: 25% (75% At/above proficient)

1st Grade: 26% (54% At/above proficient)

2nd Grade: 46% (54% At/above proficient)

Our practice to target improvement in ELA will be explicit, whole-group instruction at Tier 1 grounded in the science of reading, utilizing a structured ELA block with components for phonological skills development, phonics instruction, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Furthermore, small group instruction, designed to remediate skills in all areas needed, and as appropriate, for target students, including oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. We will progress monitor student growth in these areas to ensure that students are making the targeted gains.

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

The percent of students in each grade, 3-5, scoring below L3 in ELA on the spring 2023 FAST assessment was:

3rd: 43% (57% scored L3 or higher)

4th: 30% (70% scored L3 or higher)

5th: 55% (45% scored L3 or higher)

Our target group is our rising 5th grade (6th grade for 23-24), who had only 45% of students scoring proficient. Upon analysis of the group's performance in each reporting category, the area most in need of support is Reading Prose and Poetry, although only minimal difference in performance among L1/L2 students in Reading Informational Text and Reading Across Genres/Vocabulary was noted.

Lexia PowerUp baseline data has been utilized as a baseline resource for further identifying these students' greatest area of need, and Word Study (Word Analysis) (51% of students placing in intermediate or advanced levels) and Grammar (48% placing in intermediate or advanced) performance is significantly lower than comprehension (83% placing in intermediate or advanced levels).

Our primary instructional practice specifically relating to ELA is direct instruction in spelling, reading, interpreting, and applying morphemes. Research indicates that morphological skills are linked to literacy outcomes, including word reading, spelling and reading comprehension. Instruction on morphemes enables students to read and comprehend multisyllabic words and more complex vocabulary/text.

In addition, our instructional practice to target improvement in ELA will be small group instruction, designed to remediate skills in all areas needed, and as appropriate, for target students, including oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

We will progress monitor to ensure that students are making adequate gains.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Prior-year (spring 2023) STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading data provided norm-referenced performance scores, including students considered At/Above Proficient by scoring at or above the 41st percentile and with a scale score of 749:

Kindergarten: 75% At/above proficient

1st Grade: 54% At/above proficient

2nd Grade: 54% At/above proficient

Baseline data for 2023-20234 on the STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading assessment reveals the following cohort data:

Kindergarten: (Assessments not yet completed, as of 9/9) (No prior-year cohort comparison)

1st Grade: 54% At/above proficient

2nd Grade: 32% At/above proficient

2023 fall baseline placement in Lexia Core5/PowerUp reveals:

27% of CHE Kdg students placed in grade level material,

29% of CHE first-grade students placed in grade level material, and

17% of CHE second grade students placed in grade level material.

Our measurable outcome for kindergarten will be to meet or exceed 60% proficiency by FAST PM3.

Our measurable outcome for first grade will be to meet or exceed 64% proficiency by FAST PM3.

Our measurable outcome for second grade will be to meet or exceed 60% proficiency by FAST PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Prior-year (spring 2023) FAST PM3 data provided achievement level data and related proficiency percentages. FDOE reports reveal:

57% of CHE 3rd graders scored L3 or higher,
70% of CHE 4th graders scored L3 or higher,
45% of CHE 5th graders scored L3 or higher, and
57% of CHE 6th graders scored L3 or higher

2023 fall baseline PM3 data reveals:

(3rd grade assessments not yet taken, as of 9/9/23)
33% of CHE 4th graders scored L3 or higher,
49% of CHE 5th graders scored L3 or higher, and
48% of CHE 6th graders scored L3 or higher.

2023 fall baseline placement in Lexia Core5/PowerUp reveals:

21% of CHE 3rd grade students placed in grade level material,
24% of CHE 4th grade students placed in grade level material,
28% of CHE 5th grade students placed in grade level material, and
6th grade intermediate or advanced placement in PowerUp was
51% for Word Study
48% for Grammar, and
83% for Comprehension

Our measurable outcome for CHE 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th graders will be to meet or exceed 60% proficiency by FAST PM3.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Clay Hill Elementary School's area of focus, ELA, will be monitored ongoing throughout the school year using progress monitoring tools. Results will be based on FAST scores. Teachers will utilize Learning Targets, Checks for Understanding, and Instruction Aligned to Assessment Results to improve teaching and learning, Rigorous/On-Level Content, explicit engagement strategies (i.e., Think-Pair-Share, CFU's, collaboration, etc.), and academic ownership (i.e., student data analysis, goal setting, & tracking, parent engagement in data monitoring and action steps) to employ and to accelerate learning to teach the Florida Best Standards while monitoring the instructional trajectory of our area of focus.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Reed, Adele, areed@oneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Weekly PLCs to create common formative assessments, analyze student data, and refine instructional practices are consistent and collaborative. Small group differentiated instruction based on individual student indicated needs closes gaps to leverage proficiency.

Small group instruction will be incorporated in all ELA classrooms through the provision of classroom assistants and/or ESE coteachers.

Explicit comprehension strategies will be incorporated into all ELA classrooms.

Evidence-based programs that address identified gaps, aligned with the science of reading/6 components of reading will be introduced via whole- and small-group instruction during the ELA block at all grades.

Direct instruction, via Corrective Reading and Spelling through Morphographs will be introduced to students exhibiting a substantial reading deficiency at the small-group level, and to whole-group, per demonstrated need as evidence by end of year data (grade 6).

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

PLCs improve instructional practices and leverage student achievement. Data reviews increase the effectiveness of small group and differentiation practices to individualize student learning based upon need. Small group instruction provides focused, intensive interventions for students at risk for reading deficiencies to close learning gaps and elevate proficiency levels.

EvidenceforESSA.org provides the following rating for evidence-based programs used to support the science of reading/6 components of reading:

- Sound Partners - strong
- Lexia Core5/PowerUp - strong
- Raz-Plus - strong
- Corrective Reading - strong
- PALS - strong

The December 2007 study of Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades, published by the IES (Institute of Education Science) concluded:

- Small group instruction: STRONG level of evidence of effectiveness
- Direct instruction: STRONG level of evidence of effectiveness

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
Professional Learning- Teachers are utilizing supports through monthly, administrative-led professional learning focusing on ELA strategies.	Reed, Adele, aereed@oneclay.net
The Literacy Leadership team meets monthly to review progress monitoring data and collaborate on best practices, evidenced by classroom walkthrough and student achievement data.	Reed, Adele, aereed@oneclay.net
The onsite Literacy Coach provides support through modeling, mentoring, data analysis and small group instruction.	Reed, Adele, aereed@oneclay.net
Coaching will occur via weekly administrator walkthroughs and subsequent feedback. In addition, formal observation data will provide teacher feedback on opportunities to improve practice.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Progress monitoring data will be reviewed no less than monthly and shared with literacy leadership and/or teachers to ensure that instructional adjustments are made, as appropriate.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Benchmark assessment data will be collected, followed by Data Meetings with each team to include the development of instructional action plans for long-range small group instruction.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Teachers will meet with PLCs, weekly, to enhance teaching and meet goals set for essential standards, with emphasis on ELA.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net
Admin and literacy leaders will participate in ongoing administrative professional learning (LETRS, Lexia Core5/PowerUp) to enhance the quality of feedback and implementation.	Reed, Adele, adele.reed@myoneclay.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be disseminated through multiple means, both face-to-face, and digital, including: quarterly School Advisory Council meetings, monthly Coffee & Conversation with the Principals meetings, weekly staff newsletters, and monthly Leadership Team and PBIS Team meetings. The SIP is also made publicly available in our lobby and at the school's website at <https://che.myoneclay.net>.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Positive relationships with parents, families, and community members are built through the execution of on-campus events, including Fall Festival, Spring Fling, parent/teacher conferences, and multiple Title I Parent and Family Engagement Events that focus expressly on engaging parents in school improvement targets in reading, math, and PBIS. The school's webpage is located at <https://che.myoneclay.net/>, where the Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Clay Hill Elementary will strengthen academics and increase the amount and quality of learning time while providing an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Title I Funds will be utilized to supplement core instruction through the provision of classroom assistants, supplementary instructional materials, and instructional materials. In the area of ELA and Mathematics this will be done by: shared weekly instructional planning time between exceptional education teachers general education teachers; data driven small group instructional practices; curriculum aligned with the Florida Best Standards; professional development opportunities for teachers using high yield writing program.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The resources and strategies incorporated in the CHE SIP were development in coordination with The Florida Inclusion Network.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

CHE provides school-based mental health services through the provision of our onsite Licensed Mental Health counselor. We also provide mentoring from our resource teachers who work with students referred by their teachers for extra life skills support.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

PBIS and discipline data is used to monitor students who may be in need of Tier 2 behavior support. These students are provided with individualized behavior plans, interventions, and explicit data monitoring, to address problem behavior and intervene.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Weekly professional development, including whole-group, Professional Learning Communities, and vertical teams, as well as book clubs focusing on effective strategies for teaching and learning, along with the provision of an onsite Instructional Coach all promote the development of teacher quality and retention.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Clay Hill Elementary school supports the transition of preschoolers to elementary programs via Childfind services, our onsite Pre-K ESE 3-5 program, and Voluntary Prekindergarten Program, as well as our partnership with our local prekindergarten provider, Kids World, with whom we collaborate to promote the effective transition of preschool students to Kindergarten.

Clay County Schools

Clay Virtual Franchise School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Clay Virtual Franchise

2306 KINGSLEY AVE #20, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://cva.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to offer a virtual education experience which allows students to dream, achieve, and soar anywhere, anytime on any path.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clay Virtual Academy will provide students a learning path in an innovative online environment where mastery learning is the focus of each child's motivation, organization, and dedication in preparing them to be leaders in a global marketplace.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stilianou, Amanda	Principal	The principal's job duties include but are not limited to all aspects of overseeing the academic, behavior, fiscal, and operational tasks required of the institution and directly supervising staff in these tasks. The principal is primarily involved in analyzing school data trends and identifying priority improvement targets, strategies, and goals.
Garcia, Linda	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal's job duties include supporting the principal in ensuring all tasks are completed and in directly supervising staff in these tasks. The assistant principal serves on SAC as the administrative representative and is primarily responsible for drafting the SIP as well as working with stakeholders to develop appropriate goals and monitor progress.
	Curriculum Resource Teacher	As the blended learning curriculum specialist, Carol's duties include working with our on school site lab facilitators, administrators and guidance departments as a liaison between our school and teachers with their full time students taking classes with CVA as blended students. She works closely with our teachers to provide instructional supports on site and virtually. She serves as the SAC chair and is directly involved in the analysis of school data and the development and monitoring of SIP goals.
Weaver, Gayle	Curriculum Resource Teacher	As a distance learning specialist, Gayle's duties involve being an expert in virtual learning best practices, coordinating teacher professional development activities for the year and analyzing student work data trends weekly. She is actively involved in identifying school improvement areas to target, establishing appropriate growth goals, and monitoring progress.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process to develop the SIP involves the leadership team through data analysis and improvement target setting. Additionally, the SAC is involved (which includes teachers, parents, students and community members) by reviewing student assessment data and other data trends like attendance and completion rates, working on the draft of the school improvement plan to modify or approve identified targeted areas, the strategies chosen, and goals established.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Using the states progress monitoring during PM 1 and PM2 the SIP targets and goals will be reviewed and revised as needed. Additional data from district assessments in reading and math (Lexia and I-Ready Math) will be used to monitor progress. Data from our virtual student system for on pace and grades will be used to monitor attendance and other student work habit behaviors that predict success and behavior goals will be modified as needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 4-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: I 2018-19: A 2017-18: I
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64			67			81		
ELA Learning Gains	59			52			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56			40			92		
Math Achievement*	48			53			64		
Math Learning Gains	55			33			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36			29			70		
Science Achievement*	51			64			79		
Social Studies Achievement*	61			74			74		
Middle School Acceleration	53			56			50		
Graduation Rate	94						82		
College and Career Acceleration	44						52		
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	87
Graduation Rate	94

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	58			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	59	56	48	55	36	51	61	53	94	44	
SWD	46	37	42	44	54	30	31	68		85	36	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63	59		32	43		45	64		100	42	
HSP	65	52		64	63		50	64		79	27	
MUL	70			40								
PAC												
WHT	70	59	43	57	55	31	60	73		96	48	
FRL	67	54		41	44		44	71		94	47	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	52	40	53	33	29	64	74	56			
SWD	40	37	25	37	38	29	48	36				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	43	35	29	22	27	38	77	46			
HSP	74	64	62	60	31	14	67	70				
MUL	73	57		50	33		58					
PAC												
WHT	66	49	36	57	35	35	69	70	53			
FRL	64	48	42	47	33	20	59	85	30			

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	81	72	92	64	53	70	79	74	50	82	52	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	74		74	57		80	79	50	77	54	
FRL	79	73		63	54							

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

3rd grade math showed the lowest performance at 40% proficiency on the end of year state assessment. This was a 2% increase over the previous year. Contributing factors include need for additional student practice and live lessons.

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

Algebra 1 EOC was low performing at 42% proficiency and drop of 28% from the prior year. Biology EOC dropped 35%. Contributing factors include increasing gaps in student foundational knowledge and a lack of student participation in live instructional opportunities throughout the year in our virtual setting.

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.

3rd grade math has the largest gap compared to the state average with 19% below state average. Alg 1 has a 12% gap and Bio EOC had a 16% gap. Trends identify that students need additional practice and remediation of foundational skills that is not provided in the virtual curriculum delivered to the students.

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

8th grade math grew 38% and Civics EOC grew 28%. An increased focus on the essential standards, alignment to state assessment, and improved progress monitoring lead to these increases.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance (submitting work weekly) is our biggest concern related to students at risk.

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

Biology, Algebra/Geometry EOC, Attendance, ELA/Reading Grades 3-10

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Attendance at the virtual school is determined by students submitting work weekly and remaining on pace. Last year, CVA students averaged 78% weekly attendance (submitted at least one assignment per class weekly). FLVS establishes a goal of 90% weekly attendance/work submission.

Measurable Outcome:

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

82% of students will submit work weekly and will be on pace.

Monitoring:

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

Through reports available in teacher accounts with FLVS, students' weekly work submissions and pace can be tracked.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

For this strategy, teachers will be very specific on what attendance to virtual school looks like and teachers will analyze student data twice a week and students who are not submitting work will be contacted and support offered. Specific pacing guides with checkpoints are used in each class to specify exactly what work should be done each week. Teachers have engaging and easy to use welcome pages that explain expectations. Teachers have welcome calls with students and parents in the first 14 days of class to set clear expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Setting clear and specific behavior guidelines and expectations is a proven strategy to improve student behavior outcomes and improve school culture.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Establish an academic success team and student tracking system for weekly progress monitoring for students, procedures for referring a student to the success team, and action steps members will take. The team will analyze data weekly.

Person Responsible: Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

By When: August 10, 2023 and monitored weekly

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students taking Algebra and Geometry have not been successful on the EOC. (Alg- 42% pass rate/ Geo- 53% pass rate). Algebra 1 is a graduation required pass EOC and both EOCs count for 30% of the students' overall final grade making this a top priority target. Additionally, both EOCs experienced drops in scores with a 28% drop in Algebra 1 EOC.

Measurable Outcome:

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

55% of students in Algebra 1 and Geometry will be proficient on end of year state assessments given in May 2023 (EOC).

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored on baseline and mid-year district assessment, through teacher tracking of student mastery of content as demonstrated on tests and quizzes and the discussion based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tutoring one-to-one and in small group will be used to provide students with additional practice with modeling and guided practice with the teacher via zoom live lessons and weekly in-person live tutoring will be available for student to attend.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted academic tutoring has shown to have a high effect size when used to provide remediation to students during the learning cycle. Teachers will use data from student coursework progress to align tutoring sessions to meet student learning needs. This will also provide opportunities for students to receive feedback during the learning process and not just when they submit assignments for grading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Secondary Math PLCs will analyze data weekly and work together to identify curriculum resources and strategies that can be used to help struggling math students. Alg and Geo teacher will worked collaboratively with the district math specialist to align additional resources for targeted student assistance.

Person Responsible: Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Biology EOC pass rate this year plummeted from 82% to 47%, a drop of 35%. Since this is a foundational science class for high school students and the EOC counts as 30% of the course, this is a priority improvement target for our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

55% of students will pass the Biology EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored through their coursework progress on tests/ quizzes and during Discussion Based Assessments. Additionally, during discussion based assessments the teacher will provide specific feedback related to how these topics may be presented on the EOC and provide spiral review. Students will take the district baseline and mid-year assessments to further progress monitor and align instructional activities to target student learning needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Targeted academic tutoring 1-1 or in small groups through zoom live lessons and over the phone during discussion based assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted academic tutoring 1-1 or in small groups is proven to have a high size effect. Given the online nature of our school, this strategy will allow teachers to schedule tutoring sessions around the needs of groups of students or individuals. Teachers will be able to use resources from our district curriculum guides as well as FLVS.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PLCs for Social Studies teachers allow teachers to collaborate on best practices and strategies for working/tutoring in small groups or one to one. They will be able to analyze test items and plan tutoring lessons that align to EOC benchmarks. In addition, the Bio teacher will work collaboratively with the district

science curriculum specialist to identify additional resources, gaps in curriculum, and help analyze student data.

Person Responsible: Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on PM 3 of FAST reading given in May 2023, 62.2% of students in grades 3-10 were performing at or above benchmarks. This means that almost 40% of students are not performing on level. Literacy skills are critical to the academic success of students, especially in our virtual platform where reading the content independently is how the majority of content is delivered to the student.

Measurable Outcome:

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

68% of students grades 3-10 will score a level 3 or higher indicating reading proficiency on the end of year (PM 3) ELA assessment given in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Progress on this goal will be monitored by the state assessment system (PM 1 and PM 2), lexia progress monitoring, and literacy assessments given in the students' ELA classes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small group and one to one instruction in the components of literacy will be provided to students who are identified as needing intervention. Teachers will use Lexia, Heggerty, and PALS as curriculum resources for the small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group and one to one direction instruction in the literacy skills is a proven strategy with a high impact effect on student growth. This strategy was selected because it is a strategy that is conducive to virtual instruction and has the highest impact on student reading growth.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers in grades k-5 will attend district training on Lexia and other reading supplemental programs to become more proficient in using the literacy instructional components of these programs and how to best implement instruction and monitor student literacy growth. During PLCs, K-5 teachers will analyze literacy assessments each quarter to identify students who need additional support. ELA teachers in grades 6-10 will meet weekly in PLCs to review student progress and discuss/plan best practices for improving student literacy skills. Teachers will plan live lessons and supports for students

Clay - 7004 - Clay Virtual Franchise - 2022-23 SIP

Last Modified: 8/15/2023 <https://www.floridacims.org> Page 22 of 24

who need additional instruction to improve reading skills. Teachers will use student progress monitoring from discussion based assessments to determine student needs for live lessons or tutoring sessions.

Person Responsible: Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

Clay County Schools

Discovery Oaks Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	16

Discovery Oaks Elementary

950 OAKLEAF PLANTATION PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32065

<https://www.oneclay.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Discovery Oaks Elementary provides authentic and rigorous learning experiences in a nurturing environment where students discover their full potential and feel appreciated as individuals, fostering confidence, creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills in ALL students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Discovery Oaks Elementary is a safe, collaborative, and student-centered learning community that inspires students to develop into lifelong learners and productive global citizens through S.T.E.A.M.-based learning experiences.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Herrholtz, James	Principal	The school Principal is responsible for all leadership activities and the vision of the school.
Roberts, Mary	Assistant Principal	The AP is responsible for assisting the principal with all leadership and school vision activities.
Johnson, Avius	Assistant Principal	The AP is responsible for assisting the principal with all leadership and school vision activities.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We have a strong leadership team of teachers in each grade-level that are active in developing and monitoring our goals as a school.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We have a system in place that forces us to revisit the school improvement plan monthly as we meet with team leads around data and implementation of said plan. We pivot or revise based on that data with our students using formative and summative data collected by grade-level.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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
Absent 10% or more days	20	12	20	12	18	17	27	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	3	4	4	5	3	12	17	0	0	48
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	9	24	11	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	6	17	13	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	9	15	13	0	0	46

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	0	5	4	11	10	0	0	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	22	20	24	29	29	32	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	18	14	15	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	23	16	14	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	11	16	14	0	0	50

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	22	20	24	29	29	32	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	18	14	15	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	23	16	14	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	11	16	14	0	0	50

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70			70			75		
ELA Learning Gains	67			60			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57			37			63		
Math Achievement*	77			74			87		
Math Learning Gains	78			73			83		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65			58			75		
Science Achievement*	62			64			78		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	47			62			64		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	523
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	85			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK	62			
HSP	64			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	67	57	77	78	65	62					47
SWD	36	52	52	46	65	54	22					
ELL	37	50	40	42	56	50						47
AMI												
ASN	100	62		100	77							
BLK	60	65	48	67	76	70	49					
HSP	57	64	65	72	73	61	57					
MUL	79	81		73	60							
PAC												
WHT	80	69	57	86	84	60	77					
FRL	52	60	54	60	73	64	38					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	60	37	74	73	58	64					62
SWD	34	42	32	41	56	43	36					
ELL	38	40		67	70							62

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	91	64		96	73							
BLK	61	51	32	63	63	45	53					
HSP	67	75		81	84		69					
MUL	67			62								
PAC												
WHT	77	62	33	80	79	76	70					
FRL	65	53	35	65	68	42	58					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	69	63	87	83	75	78					64
SWD	52	65	77	68	85	81	65					
ELL	55	72		73	74							64
AMI												
ASN	80	67		93	92							
BLK	62	67	64	81	80	72	63					
HSP	80	72	73	87	79		80					
MUL	75	58		74	83							
PAC												
WHT	80	71	63	91	84	76	91					
FRL	66	71	70	81	84	72	70					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Science was an area that we did not perform as well as we expected. I do think with the new assessments performance may be lower than expected as we get used to the performance level expected out of students. In a standards setting year for a state assessment that is to be expected. We also think students will perform better on the computer based platform. The instruction will be centered as a project-based learner centered model which is more hands-on and will improve performance.

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

Science again was an area of decline along with third ELA. It was a surprising decline in performance.. I again restate that in a standards setting year subpar score performance can be expected as we adjust to the new norming of the assessment.

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.

We will focus on our science standards. Our team has already met several times over the summer to identify our power standards to insure we improve in that category. We have not only strengthening tier one instruction but we have also married science and literacy standards.

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

We continue to improve our instruction as we use the county oneclay vision plan. Our teachers are standards based driven that daily create success criteria for the standard that continue our strong instructional vision. We have effective Professional Learning Communities that utilize student data and take corrective action. Our k-2 data was very strong and outperformed prior years setting strong overall performance in grade 3.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

We are concerned about the number of Level 1's in ELA and our students who are missing school over 10% of the time.

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

1. Science
2. ELA
3. Culture of learning

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If we provide strong evidence based instructional techniques consistent delivery while setting high expectations for all students we will improve overall engagement levels, increase student ownership which should then increase our performance in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we provide strong evidence based instructional techniques consistent delivery while setting high expectations for all students we will improve overall engagement levels, increase student ownership which should then increase our performance in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Progress monitoring, SAVVAS, Common Lit.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Herrholtz (james.herrholtz@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use rigorous tier 1 instruction in an evidence based environment. Focused on the standards kids must achieve.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We need to increase teacher capacity and insure measured consistent delivery of instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PLC monthly meetings, Student Success Meetings, Team Leads Meetings, data tracking meetings.

Person Responsible: James Herrholtz (james.herrholtz@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly Meetings to review the data.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If we provide strong evidence based instructional techniques consistent delivery while setting high expectations for all students we will improve overall engagement levels, increase student ownership which should then increase our performance in SCIENCE.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we provide strong evidence based instructional techniques consistent delivery while setting high expectations for all students we will improve overall engagement levels, increase student ownership which should then increase our performance in SCIENCE.

Monitoring:

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

We will be using consistent progress monitoring, baseline data, mid-year data, and FLDOE SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Herrholtz (james.herrholtz@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We have been increasing our fidelity and usage of strong evidence based tier 1 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We need to increase teacher capacity in the teaching of science standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PLC monthly meetings, Student Success Meetings, Team Leads Meetings, data tracking meetings.

Person Responsible: James Herrholtz (james.herrholtz@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly reviewed.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We are in year three of our PBIS initiative and we have systemically overhauled our implementation and fidelity within the faculty. We have implemented the DOE Voyager bucks and opened the PBIS store for students to redeem those for good behavior not just in the hallways, cafeteria but most importantly in the classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce suspension rate by at least 20%.

Monitoring:

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

Usage of the DOE Bucks - Number of Kids earning those Bucks, Referrals and overall suspension rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Herrholtz (james.herrholtz@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

n/a

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

n/a

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PLC monthly meetings, Student Success Meetings, Team Leads Meetings, data tracking meetings.

Person Responsible: James Herrholtz (james.herrholtz@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly Reviewed.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Doctors Inlet Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Doctors Inlet Elementary School's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, rigorous, engaging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing learning opportunities that are relevant to the real world and transcend the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Doctors Inlet Elementary school exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ayers, Carolyn	Principal	
Farber, Jocelyn	Assistant Principal	
Wellons, Techla	Teacher, K-12	
Forbis, Allyson	Teacher, K-12	
Lang, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Guess, Carli	Teacher, K-12	
Haynes, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Hanlin, Anita	Teacher, ESE	
Currin, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Senters, April	School Counselor	
Mineo, Kristi	SAC Member	
Paine, Lauren	Instructional Media	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We look at our school data, discuss it with teachers, staff, and families to decide on our goals for the year. We align our school goals to the Clay County schools district goals for consistency.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We will look at our SIP quarterly as well as after progress monitoring assessments. We will adjust our instruction based on PM. We will review the progress at our School Advisory Council meetings quarterly. These meetings have representatives from our staff, community, and families.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	66%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	14	15	13	9	10	16	11	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	6

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	2	2	2	2	4	0	0	15

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	11	7	7	13	14	8	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	17	11	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	7	19	8	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	4	14	13	0	0	34

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	11	7	7	13	14	8	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	17	11	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	7	19	8	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	4	14	13	0	0	34

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	59			63			63		
ELA Learning Gains	56			65			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			52			58		
Math Achievement*	62			64			72		
Math Learning Gains	70			64			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76			40			58		
Science Achievement*	70			69			55		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	36			73					

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	69			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	56	53	62	70	76	70					36
SWD	30	41	43	37	51	64	32					
ELL	62	67		54	79							36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	61	63		47	56	55						
HSP	65	64	50	58	84	94	69					
MUL	54			62								
PAC												
WHT	57	54	56	65	70	78	68					
FRL	51	52	49	53	63	70	60					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	65	52	64	64	40	69					73
SWD	40	49	40	44	59	38	52					
ELL	36			43								73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	69		45	62							
HSP	55	71		61	71							80
MUL	44	30		50	60							
PAC												
WHT	68	67	54	69	63	40	72					
FRL	54	60	65	52	52	50	52					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	61	58	72	70	58	55					
SWD	39	57	63	65	76	47	41					
ELL	53	42		63	77							
AMI												
ASN	90			100								
BLK	47	56	54	51	59	38	31					
HSP	57	70		67	50							
MUL	50	36		61	64							
PAC												
WHT	67	63	57	76	73	64	63					
FRL	50	52	55	70	73	61	40					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Overall ELA Achievement - We have declined over the past several year in this area. With the addition of the new curriculum and standards our teachers struggled to get all the information in during the instructional day. They have created systems to help support learning and our struggling readers.

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

Overall ELA Achievement - We have declined over the past several year in this area. With the addition of the new curriculum and standards our teachers struggled to get all the information in during the instructional day. Staff have created systems to help support learning and our struggling readers with the Science of reading and proficiency.

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.

ELA - most schools in the state had issues with the proficiency

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

Science 79%; We had a schoolwide focus dedicated resources and teachers to help our Science scores. We had engaging targeted lessons to help close learning gaps and misconceptions for all 5th grade Science and fair game standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance and referrals for high frequency students. The more class they miss the bigger the gap becomes instructionally for reading, math, and writing.

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

Teacher Retention & Development
 Student & Family engagement
 Reading Proficiency
 Math Proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have a new teacher and included new to DIS teacher mentoring program to focus on best instructional practices in and out of the classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improved alignment to the CCDS Instructional vision based on classroom walkthroughs, classroom management /discipline data, and evaluations. By completing these session we will decrease classroom management and behavioral issues while increasing student engagement and FAST scores. By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase student engagement and accountability from 34.70% to 40.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the progress for our specific teachers by informal classroom walkthroughs and evaluations. By completing these session we will decrease classroom management and behavioral issues while increasing student engagement and FAST scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will define and teach how to incorporate positive expectations and interventions Teachers and staff will establish positive connections that foster positive relationships with students. Teachers and families will have meaningful two-way communication. Teachers will have access to coaching, feedback and professional learning to help with these interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will have trusting relationships and meaningful communication with families. This will help educate families about their children's progress and school services. Teachers will engaged in professional learning around best instructional / communication practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will create a personal connection to ensure every child has an advocate. This will help with classroom student engagement and with the families of Doctors Inlet Elementary. Teachers will track progress, scores, and engagement through attendance, discipline data, and improved classroom grades.

Person Responsible: Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

By When: On going throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students will improve their ELA reading proficiency in all academic areas. We will use subgroups and demographic information to identify and support our populations of learners needing additional interventions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase reading proficiency from 58 to 62 by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the PM assessments for FAST as well as evidence based reading strategies to support learning for all readers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use Progress Monitoring, Individual & Small Group Instruction, Provide Additional Programs/ tutoring Outside of the Regular School Day Learning at home: Share ideas to promote at-home learning so parents can monitor and help with homework (PFE) as well as having classroom discussions and high level questioning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will use the following to provide rationale for reading proficiency with our students: Phonological Awareness and Phonemic awareness instruction (Strong): The National Reading Panel found positive effects of phonemic awareness (PA) instruction on improving students' ability to apply phonemic awareness in their reading and spelling. Learning to manipulate phonemes in words helped the students learn to read.

Explicit, systematic phonological awareness instruction: strong evidence
Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence

*Students who have been explicitly taught multiple comprehension strategies demonstrate greater improvements in reading comprehension. However, students should be proficient with each strategy before they attempt to combine them.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 provide targeted instruction and assistance for struggling students through small group instruction with our staff. We will use district supported materials and technology to close achievement gaps. Data notebooks will be used to help track and identify needs of students with instructional levels.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the school year.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students will improve their Math proficiency in all academic areas. We will use subgroups and demographic information to identify and support our populations of learners needing additional interventions

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Math Proficiency from 65 to 67 by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the PM assessments for FAST as well as evidence based reading strategies to support learning for all readers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use and provide hands on manipulatives with visual representations for students to help with comprehension of math. We will communicate ideas to promote learning at home with families. Staff will support small group instruction by looking at the data and targeting specific skills and interventions with students. Afterschool sessions will be provided for additional learning opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By continually monitoring a child's progress, teachers can gather the information they need to match lessons to an individual child's knowledge level. Current math objectives should be coordinated with activities in the classroom and lessons in other subject areas so children can master skills and extend concepts. Struggling students should receive explicit instruction to ensure that they have the foundational skills and conceptual knowledge necessary for understanding grade level content. Modeling with unambiguous explanations and strong demonstrations that use clear and concise language, variety and active student participation makes instruction more explicit.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Staff will use small group instruction based on data to help students achieve proficiency. Teachers will be provided opportunities to observe other highly effective teachers to improve their instructional practice. Staff will have the opportunity to collaborate and plan together for increased student achievement.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Clay County Schools

Fleming Island Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Fleming Island Elementary School

4425 LAKESHORE DR, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fie.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will prepare our students to be independent life-long learners. We will provide a learning environment that is centered on our students, directed by our teachers, and supported by our homes and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fleming Island Elementary is a supportive and inclusive environment which engages and inspires students by promoting a growth mindset and belief that all students are capable of learning. We want our students to be problem solvers utilizing critical thinking skills to make a greater impact on the world.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McConnell, Mallory	Principal	Analyzes data and works with team to develop goals for school based on historical academic and social emotional learning progress
Dover, Julie	Assistant Principal	Analyzes data and works with team to develop goals for school based on historical academic and social emotional learning progress
Barnard, Robin	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Lead
Glidden, Karla	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Lead
Tully, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Lead
Doane, Lana	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Team Lead
Burt, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Lead
Harrell, Kim	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Lead
Geiger, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Lead
Johnson, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Team Lead
Snyder, Leigh	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Lead
McCarthy, Karen	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Lead

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We meet 6 times per year involving the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, families, and business/community leaders. We use a various data to review the needs of the campus from survey, climate data, and parental/stakeholder feedback.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We meet 6 times per year involving the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, families, and business/community leaders. During our meetings we will review student performance data for academics and behavior. We will make adjustments as needed. School staff will also be monitoring data on a monthly basis for a more "real time" approach.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	8	7	5	6	12	18	14	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	5	3	0	0	0	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	4	5	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	13

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	15	9	11	14	16	19	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	7	10	16	12	10	5	0	0	64
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	15	9	11	14	16	19	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	7	10	16	12	10	5	0	0	64
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79			78			82		
ELA Learning Gains	70			72			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			45			63		
Math Achievement*	85			86			86		
Math Learning Gains	73			79			81		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66			52			69		
Science Achievement*	63			71			85		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	66			
HSP	70			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	69			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	79	70	53	85	73	66	63					
SWD	58	59	44	63	62	52	32					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	92			100								
BLK	56	67		81	58							
HSP	77	68		72	68		63					
MUL	67	67		89	81		60					
PAC												
WHT	82	70	60	87	73	70	63					
FRL	75	76	63	74	73	63	62					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	78	72	45	86	79	52	71					
SWD	49	50	32	67	62	41	50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63			75								
HSP	76	69		84	53		79					
MUL	67			86								
PAC												
WHT	81	73	42	87	82	50	72					
FRL	73	70		80	77	50	62					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	82	68	63	86	81	69	85					
SWD	55	53	50	64	65	60	60					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	69			77								
HSP	80	46		67	69							
MUL	90	64		76	64							
PAC												
WHT	81	70	65	89	83	76	88					
FRL	75	71	60	68	56	33	90					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Looking at data, the greatest need for improvement is in our ESE subgroup as well as 4th Grade ELA and 6th Grade Math. ELA Proficiency for 3rd (79%), 4th (80%), and 5th (79%) are very strong and ranked 1st out of 29 elementary schools. 6th Grade ELA is 76% and currently ranked 3rd in our district. Our continued area of concern lies in our SWD and primarily our rising 5th graders where 46% of SWD were proficient. Math proficiencies were even higher for the school and 6th grade is our biggest concern. SWD data also continues to be a concern in Math and will be our academic focus. We are concerned as the population progresses up to the next grade level.

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

Our continued area of concern lies in our SWD and primarily our rising 5th graders where 46% of SWD were proficient. We had also seen a science decline and the gap was closed, but this will continue to be a focus areas since we have many new teachers leading the work this year.

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.

The state data is not included in our chart, however we are concerned with Math proficiency with SWD and the learning gains.

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

We were very happy with the growth in our 5th grade science scores. The growth from the previous year was up 17 percentage points. A direct focus was placed in this area with support from the PLC process. Teachers collaborated with others including other schools.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance data shows 3rd Quarter attendance was up to 94.65% from 88% last year, the highest showing all year. Previous year's data from 19-20 and before show data into 96%. We still would like to focus and improve our school ADA rate. Behavior data shows students are struggling with appropriate social skills as well as inappropriate language. We feel this area needs to be addressed and we plan to do this through PBIS and our Guidance department.

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

1. Learning Gains ELA
2. Learning Gains Math
3. 3rd Grade Reading Proficiency
4. Science

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our continued area of concern lies in our SWD and primarily our rising 5th graders where 46% of SWD were proficient in the 22-23 school year in reading and 63% in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We are setting a goal of a 7% percentage point gain in reading across the school for our SWD and have set a 5% percentage point goal in math.

Monitoring:

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

Professional Development around High Leverage Practices, SDI and UDL strategies, and expectations for standards based lesson targets and success criteria.

Walkthrough feedback and Coaching will be required for this expectation. We will work to create a supportive environment where teachers feel comfortable seeking guidance and assistance when necessary.

Data-Informed Instruction will be a big focus this year. Implementation of the quarterly "Data Dive" meetings will promote a culture of data-informed instruction.

Recognize and celebrate teachers' success in implementing these instructional practices.

Administration and teachers will track student progress (FAST, Lexia, I-Ready) in data profile sheets to determine student progress. In addition, administration will meet with teachers each quarter to review informal and formal data to determine if students are making gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will be working to implement professional development/training throughout the course of the year and through PLCs related to the High Level Instructional Practices introduced for SWD at the ESE Summer Summit. We will strategically plan integration and training into our monthly meetings with staff that also support the One Clay Vision for Instruction.

We will also be utilizing specially designed instruction and intentional small group instruction this year within our school. A quarterly data dive to target and track the performance of students who are not routinely meeting grade level expectations and performance.

Teachers will utilize small group, differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students in the SWD subgroup. Teachers will utilize evidence-based materials and resources such as From Phonics to Reading, Wilson Reading, and Lexia.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we lead using the collaborative team actions centered around student data, then we impact teacher's core instructional practices in Collaboration, Assessment, SEL, and Instruction, Which results in increased student performance (proficiency and learning gains).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will meet with small groups of students daily that include those in the SWD subgroup.

Person Responsible: Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

By When: Daily

Teachers will include time in the daily schedule for a remediation block in which all teachers will utilize evidence-based remediation as they meet with these daily small groups.

Person Responsible: Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

By When: Daily

Leadership team will monitor the progress of students in the SWD subgroup through student and teacher data sheets, as well as profile sheets.

Person Responsible: Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Behavior data shows students are struggling with appropriate social skills as well as inappropriate language. We feel this area needs to be addressed and we plan to do this through PBIS and our Guidance department. We are continuing to build upon the year one success we had with our Stingray School Store.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the recent school climate survey, 93% students in all grade levels will indicate that they strongly agree they receive positive recognition from adults. 95 percent of adults will indicate that they strongly agree that students receive positive recognition from adults.

Monitoring:

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

Lessons are already in place, but need to be revised and edited to include the new school-wide guidelines. Expectation stations will be used at the start of the year. Lessons will be taught by classroom teachers during the first week of school. PBIS assemblies by grade level are held the first week of school. School wide expectations will be developed, taught, and posted in different locations around campus. School wide reward system will be implemented. PBIS team will analyze data and implement interventions to address concerns.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The school will utilize a reward system aligned to the school wide expectations as well as resources from 7 Mindsets. Common language will be utilized, school wide based on the 7 mindsets and school expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School wide expectations is part of PBIS Tier 1. The 7 Mindsets are the district adopted resources for implementation of character trait and life skills lesson. Lessons will be retaught after winter break and spring break. Additional lessons and class visits will be conducted by teacher request or as needed based on student data and performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A school wide positive reward system, "Stingray Bucks" are given students based on the school-wide guidelines of safe, responsible, respectful, and kind. A school store is set up for students to spend these Stingray Bucks.

Person Responsible: Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring**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 impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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?

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Fleming Island High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	11
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	18

Fleming Island High School

2233 VILLAGE SQUARE PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fih.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Fleming Island High School provides excellence in education by preparing tomorrow's leaders to be determined, passionate, dedicated, and accountable through providing opportunities to soar in scholarship and leadership.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are releasing the eagle within each student to soar to limitless heights academically, socially, emotionally and physically.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pittman, Tom	Principal	Oversees policies and procedures of the daily functions at Fleming Island High School, Math Administrator
Senna, Brittany	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Instructional Technology, Science, Guidance & CTE Administrator
Labbe, Heather	Assistant Principal	Professional Development, ELA, ESE & Reading Administrator, State Testing Administrator, Climate & Culture
Mckinney, Mark	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Social Studies Admin, Instructional Materials
Cannon, Amy	Dean	School-wide Discipline, attendance monitoring, MTSS, Student Success Team Lead, PBIS

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Data is presented to the FIHS School Advisory Council to collaborate, discuss, and identify areas of focus for the current school year. The SAC team includes admin, parents, students, employees, and

business partners. In addition, our PBIS team (staff, students and admin) meets monthly to review discipline and attendance data, as well as discuss areas of need based on the climate survey.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Goals and data from SIP will be reviewed monthly in Curriculum Council, PBIS, and Literacy Team meetings. SAC will meet quarterly to monitor SIP goals. Within weekly content area PLCs a variety of available data will be reviewed consistently including state testing (FAST PM1 & PM2), district testing (baseline and midyear information), and district supplemental online platform data (Aleks, Lexia, etc).

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	73			71			71		
ELA Learning Gains	62			56			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47			42			39		
Math Achievement*	57			57			65		
Math Learning Gains	56			33			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48			35			41		
Science Achievement*	88			83			83		
Social Studies Achievement*	78			86			93		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	99			99			97		
College and Career Acceleration	73			71			63		
ELP Progress	77			56			23		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	758
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	99

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	59			
HSP	62			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	73	62	47	57	56	48	88	78		99	73	77
SWD	37	49	40	25	39	36	54	58		96	31	
ELL				20				45		100	42	77
AMI												
ASN	94	78		77	64		100	86		100	77	
BLK	60	55	50	35	57	35	88	62		100	44	
HSP	63	58	47	50	47	44	84	67		100	64	
MUL	72	49		70	76		89	74		100	67	
PAC												
WHT	75	63	49	60	56	53	88	81		99	78	
FRL	57	52	30	47	50	45	82	63		98	57	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	56	42	57	33	35	83	86		99	71	56
SWD	31	40	36	30	33	31	62	81		100	41	
ELL				10						100	36	56
AMI												
ASN	88	77		65	22		100			100	89	
BLK	52	46	36	44	37	62	70	81		100	54	
HSP	60	47	38	44	36	37	78	83		98	66	
MUL	78	58		62	17		86	85		96	78	
PAC												
WHT	73	57	42	60	33	32	84	87		99	72	
FRL	54	44	26	42	36	38	72	79		99	60	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	57	39	65	48	41	83	93		97	63	23
SWD	30	45	44	41	39	37	47	86		85	24	
ELL	19	23	18	26	47		55	82				23
AMI												
ASN	80	64		73	54		76	100		100	80	
BLK	58	48	41	43	44	39	73	89		98	35	
HSP	63	53	43	53	40	29	80	88		96	62	27
MUL	61	44	31	54	57	58	70	100		100	50	
PAC												
WHT	74	58	38	71	48	42	86	94		97	66	
FRL	49	42	32	52	41	36	70	86		93	42	20

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

In regards to the area with the lowest proficiency percentage, ELA proficiency was at 73% (with no change from the previous school year, 2021-2022). The 22-23 school year was the first school year in which the new FAST was implemented. Teachers and students had to acclimate to the new test structure and expectations.

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

The greatest decline was a 2% drop within Biology. FIHS had an 88% proficiency rate in 21-22 and 86% in 22-23. The entire Biology team was teaching 6 classes with no planning period. This significantly limited the amount of time Bio teachers had to analyze data and reflect on deficiencies.

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.

FIHS was above the state average in all categories. The greatest gap when compared to the state average is in ELA. The state average is 49% for the 22-23 school year, with FIH having 73%. 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers at FIHS met regularly during PLCs to analyze data from a variety of sources including FAST PM1 and PM2 data, Lexia, Achieve3000, and Savvas BOY, MOY, EOY. In addition, students who needed additional support in ELA were intentionally scheduled into Intensive Reading.

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, Math achievement/proficiency had the most improvement with an increase of 17%. In 22-23 Clay County amended the Student Progression plan for students entering high school below grade level in math. Instead of sitting in a block of Algebra 1A and 1B (and sitting for the EOC) their first year, we are now separating 1A and 1B to take place over two school years to allow for additional support and remediation prior to sitting for the Algebra 1 EOC. We also place students who need extra support in Geometry in a Foundations Math Skills elective course to provide additional support and remediation.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

NA

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

1. Close the gap between overall proficiency within ELA, and the proficiency rate of our SWD population.
2. Close the gap between overall proficiency within ELA, and the proficiency rate of our ELL population.
3. Increase Bio EOC scores (only decrease for the 22-23 school year)

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data from the 2021-22 school year shows a difference of 26% difference between our students with disabilities and our overall proficiency in ELA. (47% for SWD and 73% overall proficiency).

Measurable Outcome:

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

FIHS will work to improve our SWD proficiency in ELA by at least 2%.

Monitoring:

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

Various forms of data will be monitored including FAST PM 1 & 2, Savvas, Lexia, and common classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Intentional scheduling with our SWD students took place within Intensive Reading. Students were placed in specific IR sections based on placement exams to provide targeted interventions (including decoding, spelling through morphographs, etc.). Support Facilitators will also be pushing in to multiple sections of 9th and 10th grade ELA classes to provide additional assistance and support to our SWD students and implement Specially Designed Instruction in the classroom environment. Teachers are being trained in high leverage practices to incorporate high cognitive and high participation techniques to improve student engagement, collaboration and overall growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our SWD will have the opportunity to remain in their LRE by having Support Facilitators push-in to ELA, allowing them to receive both original instruction from English certified teachers, while receiving differentiated and specially designed instruction and support from ESE certified educators.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

-PM 1 Data reviewed/analyzed for SWD

-Plan of action determined by ELA teacher in collaboration with ESE push-in educator and/or case manager

-Regularly monitor and analyze continuous data (FAST, Lexia, Savvas) and adjust instruction and support based on the needs for our SWD population

Person Responsible: Heather Labbe (heather.labbe@myoneclay.net)

By When: -Data review for planning beginning in September after PM 1 window closes

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2022-2023 school year, the Biology EOC was the only state exam in which the overall proficiency dropped from 88% to 86%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FIH plans to achieve an 88% proficiency on the Biology EOC.

Monitoring:

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

- Data from district baseline and midyear exams
- Common assessments created by the Biology team (both formative and summative to analyze data year-round and between district assessments)
- Penda Data (used for remediation and extension)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Senna (brittany.senna@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- Remediation and data-driven instruction based on data provided by multiple assessments (district, team common assessments, and Penda). Students also maintain individualized data notebooks .
- Intentional scheduling (honors vs standard)
- Additional science teacher added to bio team (to lower class numbers and allow teachers ample planning time to look and analyze data)
- Boot Camps and tutoring provided after school hours. Each session is tailored to cover specific standards or benchmarks for students to attend based on their individual needs (shown through their data notebooks)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- Teachers are able to provide targeted remediation based on the data in regards to what concepts and standards need further instruction.
- Students whose reading skills are below grade level are given an extra year to grow both literacy and science skills, taking Environmental Science their 9th grade year prior to Biology.
- Biology teachers now have lower standard class sizes due to additional Biology teacher being hired for the 23-24 school year. With this additional teacher, the team also has more time to plan and analyze data.
- Boot Camps and after-school tutoring will cover specific benchmarks so students can analyze their own data and attend these events based on individual needs

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

- District Baseline data reviewed/analyzed
- Common Assessment data analyzed each week in team PLCs
- Student data notebooks (digital or paper) created and used to conference with Bio teacher
- Boot Camp remediation dates chosen for Spring with assigned benchmarks

Person Responsible: Brittany Senna (brittany.senna@myoneclay.net)

By When: -Baseline data reviewed/analyzed by September 30th -Student data notebooks created by October 30th -Common Assessment data review on-going through entire school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

By focusing on all aspects of students who fall within the EWS, we plan on improving student attendance, decreasing student referrals, and providing remediation and support for our LQ students (11th and 12 graders specifically).

Measurable Outcome:

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

- Student attendance will improve by at least 2%
- Student discipline referrals will decrease by at least 2%
- The percentage of 11th and 12th grade students not on track for graduation based on state assessments will decrease by 2%

Monitoring:

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

- Attendance reports to be pulled monthly. Parent correspondence to follow Clay County School District's attendance policy/decision tree. Data to be reviewed in PBIS meetings.
- Student discipline reports to be pulled monthly and reviewed in PBIS meetings.
- Monthly grad status meetings with guidance team and College and Career Coach

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- Consistent parent contact regarding student attendance policy. If deemed necessary, an SST (Student Success Team) meeting will take place with student, parent, counselor, dean, and social worker to create plan for student success.
- Increased promotion of Positive Behavior enforcement through PBIS initiatives and restorative practices for students
- Bootcamps for 11th and 12th grade students who have not yet met concordant scores required for state assessments for graduation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- Increased attendance and parental involvement during previous school year with SST meetings.
- Continued support of PBIS team initiatives, including Link Crew to give students sense of belonging and leadership to decrease discipline referrals
- Bootcamps provide opportunity for students to receive additional support and remediation prior to a high-stakes exam (such as FAST retake, ACT, or SAT).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

- Monthly attendance data pulled and SST meetings scheduled accordingly
- Monthly discipline data pulled and examined (including sharing within PBIS)
- Monthly meetings scheduled with guidance counselors to closely monitor seniors off-track for graduation

Person Responsible: Amy Cannon (amy.cannon@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly beginning the month of. September

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Clay School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	19

Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Clay

9143 PHILLIPS HGWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

<http://flva.k12.com>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Ensuring all students reach their full potential by utilizing a highly effective curriculum and implementing classes that are student-centered, data driven, and engaging for all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebrating diversity and building community through inspiration while ensuring our students are productive citizens today for success in their future endeavors of tomorrow.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Whitten, Rita	Principal	Principal of the High School will share out the School Improvement Plan and delegate the required trainings to the academic coaches and intervention teachers. She will complete data digs and analyze data to monitor progress in PLCs and Subject level meetings.
D'Esposito, Kerrie	Principal	Principal of the Middle School will share out the School Improvement Plan with faculty and delegate the required trainings to the academic coaches and intervention teachers. She will complete data digs and analyze data to monitor progress in PLCs and Subject level meetings.
O'Quinn, Nicole	Principal	Principal of the Elementary School will share out the School Improvement Plan and delegate the required trainings to the academic coaches and intervention teachers. She will complete data digs and analyze data to monitor progress in PLCs and Subject level meetings.
Hulshult, Jerry	Other	
Moore, Lauren	Math Coach	The Math coach will plan trainings for new math initiatives and facilitate PLCs and data digs to analyze student success and monitor growth.
	Reading Coach	The Literacy coach will plan trainings for new initiatives and facilitate PLCs and data digs to analyze student success and monitor growth.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Plan development includes data from surveys from teachers, parents, and students.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP Leadership Team will meet after each assessment period, 3 times a year, to review data and monitor progress toward School Improvement Plan. Administrators will complete walkthroughs and formal evaluations throughout the school year to monitor the implementation of the instructional practices in our priority focus. The team will filter and analyze data specific to our ESSA subgroups to ensure our B/AA students are making adequate progress and adjust interventions as needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	5%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	6

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53			52			51		
ELA Learning Gains	54			47			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50								
Math Achievement*	38			33			24		
Math Learning Gains	46			43			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	53			38			39		
Social Studies Achievement*	43			55			59		
Middle School Acceleration	50								
Graduation Rate	89			94					
College and Career Acceleration	5			25					
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	89

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	53	54	50	38	46		53	43	50	89	5	
SWD	40			30						90		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	36		17	54		27					
HSP	50	50		47	70		50					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	65		45	29		64	67		85	0	
FRL										93	0	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	47		33	43		38	55		94	25	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	33		20	36							
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	53		38	54		47	50		92	18	
FRL												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	45		24	29		39	59				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	44		29	29		39	57				
FRL	60			20								

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Math: We had new teachers and transitions in the math department. There was a gain in math from the previous year, but compared to our ELA scores, math is significantly lower. Students do not use manipulatives in hand, we have purchased a virtual manipulative program, Braining Camp and Desmos in the middle school. We started using Reflex Math more often mid year last year, and Braining Camp the last quarter. We did see a small increase in points from the previous year. Students struggle with number sense and math fluency.

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

Math was our area that saw a significant decline. Our students did not have manipulatives and we were transitioning to new math standards. Our students struggled with number sense and math fluency, since it wasn't a high focus over the past few years.

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 was significantly lower than the state average. Our students are virtual and have had limited math manipulatives and fluency practice. In the last quarter of the school year, we purchased a virtual manipulative program and our scores did slightly increase from last school year in math.

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

Social Studies and MS Acceleration were the areas that showed the most improvement. Teachers were strategically placed in those areas, and the school increased the availability of accelerated classes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance/engagement and students with a significant reading deficit are areas from the EWS that we are concerned with.

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

Instructional Practices: Math
School/Community Culture: Attendance/Engagement
ESSA subgroups: Black Students

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math has been significantly lower than the state average for several years now. FLCCA's average for Clay for the 2023 PM3 was 31% Proficient with the State average at 55% for 3rd-8th Grades.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the % Proficient in math achievement on the B.E.S.T Standards in grades 3rd-8th by 9 points to achieve a 40% proficient, and demonstrate a 45% in Learning Gains for all students, including those in the bottom quartile.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators and academic coaches will complete walkthroughs and formal observations to ensure teachers are using the tools and instructional practices identified in the plan for intervention. SIP Leadership Team will meet after PM1 and PM 2 to compare data, monitor growth, and adjust practices as needed based on that data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

using Nearpod and Desmos to engage students and see their work live, as well as utilize Braining Camp for virtual math manipulatives. FLCCA will also be starting each lesson with number talks to increase students mental math ability and number sense. Targeted Small group intervention is provided for T2 and T3 students. T2 students will work in small groups with the classroom teacher on grade level standards and will be assigned work in Math IXL; T3 students will work in a smaller group with a math intervention teacher working on math number sense and assigned remediation lessons in DreamBox Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using targeted small group instruction in response to intervention is proven to have a high effective size of 1.29 and general small group at .47. Classroom discussion, like number talks, has an effect size of .82. Using math manipulatives increases students understanding of math place value and number sense overall. The math programs provide math fluency practice.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Placement into small groups based on testing data from PM3 of the previous school year, focusing on T2 and T3 intervention.

Person Responsible: Lauren Moore (lmoore@k12.com)

By When: September, 2023

Train teachers in the use of Braining Camp manipulatives, Reflex, Desmos, and Number Talks.

Person Responsible: Lauren Moore (lmoore@k12.com)

By When: October, 2023

Analyze data of student growth in FAST PM2 from PM1 and PM data points collected from T2 and T3 intervention groups and Dreambox Learning Data.

Person Responsible: Lauren Moore (lmoore@k12.com)

By When: March, 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student Attendance/Engagement need to be increased for higher levels of learning, participation, and engagement within the virtual, live classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FLCCA will decrease the number of students with more than 10% absences in to 5% of our overall population.

Monitoring:

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

Our attendance specialists will be sending 5 and 10 day letters for unexcused absences, teachers will send "we missed you emails" for missed live classes, students will be placed on an engagement tracker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attendance contracts will be written with Learning Coaches and the Social Worker or attendance specialist. Administrator calls/emails will be sent that attendance is mandatory for continued enrollment. Strong Start calls and Enduring Connect Calls by the homeroom teacher builds the rapport with the families to ensure the Learning Coach assists the students with attending the live classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for increasing attendance is a direct correlation between positive attendance and grades. When the school monitors attendance and keeps in close communication with the family, it results in the Learning Coaches ensuring the students are online.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identify the students with a lower % of attendance, 10% or higher, from the previous school year and create an attendance/engagement tracker and add those students to the tracker. Then, add students to the tracker throughout the semester for monitoring

Person Responsible: Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

By When: By the end of the 1st Quarter

Weekly updates to the tracker of students that have missed more than 10 days in a semester. Attendance letters, emails and calls will be sent to the legal guardian and the learning coach.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: The attendance specialist will send these letters.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be to increase the % Proficiency of ELA and Math in our Black/African American Student Population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student achievement and learning growth in our B/AA students to at least 40% Proficient in Math and ELA.

Monitoring:

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

FLCCA will monitor the growth toward ELA standards mastery through Ongoing Progress Monitoring in PM1 and PM2 of the FAST and the final PM3, collecting data points and filtering by ESSA subgroup to ensure our B/AA students are making progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Primary Tier 3 Students will be getting a double dose of SIPPs for Foundational Phonics skills, as well as Heggerty for phonemic awareness. Interventions at the higher grade levels will be with a intervention teacher running targeted small groups focused on Pre-reading/Close Reading to build comprehension and vocabulary instruction. Students will be provided instruction and practice through MindPlay for Tier 2 and Tier 3 support as well. In math, our T3 students will be working through the intervention program Dreambox Math and working in small group for remediation in number sense and fact fluency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students need a small group instruction in foundational reading skills as proven by the Science of Reading. Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and fluency are the foundational skills they need to master before they can read to learn. As they master foundational skills, students need the small group instruction using pre-reading strategies, close reads focusing on mastery of language and comprehension. In math they need a remediation program to identify and close the gap in math foundational skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that qualify for remediation through instruction/intervention and create small groups within the master schedule

Person Responsible: Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

By When: After all students have taken FAST PM1, around the 1st week of September.

Provide small group instruction 3-4 days a week for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 students for remediation in reading and math.

Person Responsible: Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Identification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that qualify for remediation through instruction/intervention and create small groups within the master schedule

Person Responsible: Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

By When: After all students have taken FAST PM1, around the 1st week of September.

Provide small group instruction 3-4 days a week for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 students for remediation in reading and math.

Person Responsible: Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

By When: Throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School is not receiving additional funds due to ATSI designation.

FLCCA has utilized operating FEFP funds, Title IV, and other Grants to target various software programs and tutoring to support students. For example, the ARP Targeted Math Grant was used to implement Dreambox, Reflex Math, and to provide PD for Teachers at the FCTE conference.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Green Cove Springs Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Green Cove Springs Junior High School

1220 BONAVENTURE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://gcj.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Green Cove Springs Junior High is to achieve academic excellence by cultivating student ownership, developing lifelong learners, and fostering a safe, caring culture that benefits the entire community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Green Cove Springs Junior High will provide quality education in a safe environment for our diverse student population where social responsibility is fostered and all students are motivated to master academic goals.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Demarie, James	Principal	Ensure compliance with established rules and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/ partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards.
Green, Monica	Assistant Principal	The assistant/vice principal is directly responsible to the school principal. He/she serves in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any duties outlined on the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Bleau, Chera	Teacher, K-12	The teacher is responsible directly to the principal for the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students. Establish a classroom climate conducive to learning classroom management. Demonstrate an interest in and a willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom. Provide for students of varying ability through the use of a variety of activities, techniques, questions, materials and student input (compensate for individual deprivations).
Taft, William	Teacher, K-12	The teacher is responsible directly to the principal for the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students. Establish a classroom climate conducive to learning classroom management. Demonstrate an interest in and a willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom. Provide for students of varying ability through the use of a variety of activities, techniques, questions, materials and student input (compensate for individual deprivations).

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SIP development includes all members of the leadership team, including students, parents and community leaders. Regular meetings will be held to assess data and discuss strategies to improve topics such as attendance, academic instruction, community involvement and continuing to improve the school culture at GCJ.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will monitored regularly based on PM and FAST data to track student progress, weekly PLC meetings with departments to ensure standards are being taught with fidelity and the analyze student data with teachers to ensure that achievement gaps are being targeted through differentiated instruction. Monthly whole group PLC sessions will ensure that teachers are receiving training provide students with quality instruction and understand how to create lessons based on standards that include learning targets, success criteria and aligned tasks to ensure that students can track their progress toward mastery of standards.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	120	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	37	63
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	32	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	37	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	79	122

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	60	105

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	103	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	73	147
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	61	126
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	86	162

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	69	137

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	103	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	73	147
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	61	126
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	86	162

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	69	137

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61			61			65		
ELA Learning Gains	52			53			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31			31			56		
Math Achievement*	67			64			80		
Math Learning Gains	62			52			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51			44			69		
Science Achievement*	69			65			70		
Social Studies Achievement*	79			80			78		
Middle School Acceleration	73			79			73		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	27			27			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	49			
HSP	53			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	52	31	67	62	51	69	79	73			27
SWD	23	32	23	32	42	45	33	52	74			
ELL	21	41	26	52	59	29	25	44				27
AMI												
ASN	84	88		100	86		91	100	100			
BLK	40	41	21	43	58	58	43	71	70			
HSP	53	50	33	58	55	42	62	71	77			27
MUL	69	50		62	61		73	80	69			
PAC												
WHT	65	52	34	73	63	45	76	81	71			
FRL	47	45	29	51	57	46	50	70	66			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	53	31	64	52	44	65	80	79			27
SWD	18	27	22	23	29	28	29	52	52			
ELL	20	29	18	25	42	43	17	55				27
AMI												
ASN	82	68		82	68		71	90	81			
BLK	41	35	18	39	23	25	37	51	81			
HSP	54	51	28	55	50	37	59	72	71			
MUL	68	65		58	33		67		85			
PAC												
WHT	64	55	37	70	58	55	71	86	80			
FRL	43	45	33	45	49	44	47	65	55			

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	61	56	80	75	69	70	78	73			50
SWD	31	49	50	52	67	60	45	47	38			
ELL	15	31		46	80	73						50
AMI												
ASN	84	69		90	82		75	100	76			
BLK	44	44	42	58	76	71	47	59	62			
HSP	61	63	54	73	69	54	52	75	76			
MUL	59	67		88	75		69	92	75			
PAC												
WHT	69	62	61	84	75	71	76	81	74			
FRL	48	53	55	66	73	66	55	64	52			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Based on the most recent state assessment data, ELA proficiency dropped to 58% proficiency, with 7th grade ELA increasing proficiency to 61%, 8th grade ELA dropped to 54% proficiency. Students in both grade levels showed growth, but the overall proficiency level for 8th grade dropped. With a two year comparison, that group of students showed a decline of 5 points.

While ELL and SWD students did show growth, their proficiency fell below the school, district and state average.

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

8th grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year, with proficiency dropping from 59% proficiency to 54%.

We identified reading as an area of critical need last year and have put a school-wide initiative in place to address deficiencies and increase reading comprehension. We will continue this initiative and continue working with teachers across all content areas to incorporate reading strategies into their classrooms.

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.

In both reading and math, GCJ was above the state and district average. Math was the data component with the greatest gap. with the state average for 8th grade math at 56% and GCJ at 72%. GCJ well exceeded the state average. This is due to the strength of the math team, their collaboration and strong PLC.

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

8th grade math increased by 5 points to bring proficiency to 72%.

Students offered daily opportunities to retake math assignments in our GCJ LEAD Lab. These students are sent during elective periods to ensure they do not miss core instruction.

The Master Schedule was strategically built to provide some of the most struggling math students with the highest performing math teachers to bridge gaps of their foundational math skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The first area of concern is that 219 students were absent 10% or more over the course of the school year. The second area of concern is that 63 students were suspended one or more days, which is a huge increase from the prior school year.

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

Reading Proficiency

Supporting ELL Students - increasing reading comprehension

Supporting SWD Students

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on 22-23 FAST Reading scores, reading continues to be an area of critical need. 7th grade proficiency made a slight gain to 61%, 8th grade proficiency dropped to 54%. With the new FAST test, based on school calculations, students showed growth in ELA but the overall proficiency dropped to 58% proficiency. Overall, GCJ did not meet projected learning targets in reading. Also tied to ELA achievement, another area of focus tied to this is reading achievement for ELL students. These students have been tested and placed in intensive reading groups to identify deficits and build reading capacity. They are also receiving 105 per week in Rosetta Stone in their ELA class, with an ELL assistant.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The projected outcome for reading proficiency for the 2023-24 school year will be to increase overall reading proficiency to 65%. This will be measured using data from the 22-23 and 23-24 FAST Reading assessments.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will implement writing across the curriculum using the ACE writing method to ensure that students hear common language across all classrooms to deepen understanding, articulate thinking and provide evidence to support learning. Using these strategies across the curriculum will increase student achievement in the area of reading comprehension, as teachers in all content areas will be consistently using common language to develop reading skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By establishing and utilizing school wide strategies, students will hear common academic language and identified skills across all content areas in order to build capacity and increase reading comprehension.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

These strategies are already in place and teachers are working weekly in PLC groups to analyze data, create lessons and build common assessments to monitor student needs.

Person Responsible: Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

By When: December - PM 2 May - FAST Test

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on Climate and Culture surveys of staff and students from 2022-23, data shows that continuing to build positive relationships between teachers and students will decrease the number of low level discipline referrals and increase instructional time in all classrooms. Through school-wide PBIS initiatives to focus on positive student behaviors and interactions with teachers and staff, Identified school wide expectations will be identified and recognized to celebrate student success in all areas at GCJ.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome will show data that supports that low level discipline referrals will decrease 5% throughout the school year when data is compared with the correlating month in the previous year. This data will be assessed monthly at PBIS and school-based leadership meetings.

Monitoring:

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

Through supporting teachers with PBIS Initiatives, strong Professional Learning Communities and visible administrative support, GCJ will continue a tradition of a positive culture of learning that supports teachers and students. With continued efforts to teach school-wide expectations and reduce the number of low level misbehaviors in the classroom, teachers will continue to thrive at GCJ.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Developing school-wide expectations that are clearly posted in all areas that identify behavioral expectations for students reinforces boundaries and clearly outlines how they can contribute to the positive culture of GCJ. Providing strategies that help teachers develop positive relationships with students by articulating successes in all areas allows contingent and noncontingent interactions with students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building a positive school culture where students want to attend, feel valued and understand that they have a safe place to belong is an integral part of building a healthy community and will help students grow as learners and responsible citizens.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PBIS Program - Continuing to promote school wide LEAD Expectations for all students.
Teachers identify and acknowledge positive student behaviors
Recognize students chosen by teachers who consistently exhibit LEAD Attributes.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For this school year, all standard sections of ELA and math are supported sections, with Support Facilitators pushing in to support learning with classroom teachers. We have also increased inclusion sections to make sure that all classrooms maintain around 20% of SWD students in all classrooms, which mirrors the school population. Learning Strategies class is offered to provide students more support in all content areas and teachers are being trained in learning strategies to provide differentiated instruction for students. Teachers are collaborating together weekly to discuss student needs and develop lessons to provide differentiated instruction based on areas of need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST Data in ELA and math, SWD students will increase reading proficiency by 10% over the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Data monitoring through FAST testing, formative data provided by classroom teachers and Support Facilitators

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chera Bleau (cfbleau@oneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Offering a learning strategies both as a class and as an intervention in supported classrooms to provide students with small group remediation, building study skills and organizational skills. Our Support Facilitators have received training in this area to benefit students in small group and whole group settings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this strategy is to identify areas of specific needs for these students and provide interventions to close achievement gaps.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Using strategies to help students build organizational skills, summarizing skills and study skills to close achievement gaps across all content areas.

Person Responsible: Chera Bleau (cfbleau@oneclay.net)

By When: December 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

At GCJ, both ELL and SWD subgroups fall below 41%. The strategies that we are implementing to address the deficiencies in these subgroups are as follows:

ELL students are tested and strategically scheduled into appropriate Intensive Reading sections to utilize the Corrective Reading Program outlined in Clay County's SERP plan. The reading teacher and ELL assistant will co-teach these sections of reading to serve students and increase English fluency and comprehension. Students will also receive time on Rosetta Stone weekly through their ELA class with the assistance of the ELA teacher and ELL assistant.

After review of our essa subgroup data, we have identified SWD students and placed appropriately with provided accommodations. Staffing specialists and ESE teachers collaborate and plan for supported and co-teaching sections. District personnel and Staffing Specialists provide continued PD opportunities to support teachers. Inclusive scheduling and push in support to provide all students with continued academic support. Two additional Support Facilitators to provide support in classrooms.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Grove Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Grove Park Elementary School

1643 MILLER ST, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://gpe.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Grove Park Elementary is to prepare students to become successful and productive global thinkers in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Grove Park Elementary, in development of Collective Commitments, will recognize the potential of ALL students through the power of belief, perseverance, and holding ourselves and our students accountable with high expectations.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones , Justin	Principal	Coordinate School Advisory Council Activities, monitor implementation of curriculum, monitor, build and promote teacher efficacy, maintain standards of appropriate student conduct and school atmosphere, implement programs designed to meet the unique needs of special student populations and sub-groups.
Smith, Shadreka	Assistant Principal	Assist in coordinating School Advisory Council Activities, monitoring implementation of curriculum, monitor, build and promote teacher efficacy, maintain standards of appropriate student conduct and school atmosphere, implement programs designed to meet the unique needs of special student populations and sub-groups.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

During the summer, GPE leadership hosted a community involvement event to gather input from community stakeholders. Additionally, we hosted a preliminary meeting with members from the School Advisory Council to review student needs based on student achievement. Finally, at the beginning of the school year, GPE leadership hosted a staff meeting to include all staff members. During that meeting we reviewed student performance data from the previous year. We then used guiding questions to drive a staff-wide discussion around where we needed to grow and how we could best impact our students in the upcoming year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our School Advisory Council will meet quarterly to review student performance data. In addition, our Student Success Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress. Our Leadership Team will meet monthly with District Title One to ensure compliance with our Title One Plan.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	9	5	14	9	9	11	9	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	8	19	21	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	13	33	30	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	15

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	6	5	20	20	0	0	51

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	23	18	17	22	23	16	18	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	2	5	4	4	12	6	7	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	32	16	14	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	29	26	11	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	17	7	21	32	16	14	0	0	108

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	10	18	9	0	0	40

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	4	0	10	1	1	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	23	18	17	22	23	16	18	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	2	5	4	4	12	6	7	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	32	16	14	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	29	26	11	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	17	7	21	32	16	14	0	0	108

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	10	18	9	0	0	40

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	4	0	10	1	1	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37			40			46		
ELA Learning Gains	50			58			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			52			33		
Math Achievement*	31			35			43		
Math Learning Gains	53			52			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47			54			49		
Science Achievement*	39			33			43		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	32			47			38		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	39	Yes	2	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	37	50	53	31	53	47	39					32
SWD	10	37	64	12	47	38	15					
ELL	24	65	64	19	65							32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	45	48	27	52	48	10					
HSP	37	50		34	54		45					27
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	59		36	56		77					
FRL	33	49	52	27	47	41	39					25

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	58	52	35	52	54	33					47
SWD	23	53	45	26	47	36						
ELL	24			35								47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	43	38	20	40	44	29					
HSP	33	56		52	61							46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	82		46	59		55					
FRL	43	55	36	35	50	33	36					40

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	48	33	43	41	49	43					38
SWD	24	34	33	14	39	53	20					
ELL	35	86		35	53							38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	37	38	35	40	43	28					
HSP	48	51		51	45		40					
MUL	33			45								
PAC												
WHT	63	61		48	37		68					
FRL	40	45	30	38	42	50	47					25

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The lowest performance indicator was Math proficiency at 28%. Inconsistency among staff was a concern from the previous year as all instructional positions were not filled at the beginning of the year. Additionally, Tier one Math instruction and consistent corrective instruction was a contributing factor.

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

ELA Achievement declined from 37% to 33%. Contributing factors were inconsistent Tier one instruction, staffing related issues, and challenges managing the classroom environment.

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.

The greatest gap was observed between the State's average in Math when compared to GPE's overall Math proficiency - A difference of 29 percentage points. Contributing factors were inconsistent Tier one instruction, staffing related issues, and challenges managing the classroom environment.

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

AT this time, there is no significant data point that has been identified to show growth from last year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two significant areas of concern are the number of students experience chronic absenteeism and the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency.

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

Our highest priorities are the following: Math proficiency, Reading proficiency, Attendance (reduction of chronic absenteeism and increase in average daily attendance) and an increase in students' positive outlook on school.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase MATH proficiency from 28% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

We will access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All Math teachers will administer baseline student assessments i.e. PM1, PM2, etc.

Person Responsible: Shadreka Smith (shadreka.smith@myoneclay.net)

By When: FAST baseline assessment will be complete in September and at each FAT progress monitoring interval for the 2023-2024 school year.

Collect and analyze data from school and District based assessments at a minimum of five (5) times per annum to inform instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of the year.

All students will track data using grade-level developed common methods.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

All faculty and classroom assistants will participate in professional development and collaborative planning for small-group instructional best practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

An instructional coach will support professional learning communities, and direct coaching to instructional staff regarding lesson structure, and implementation, remediation, etc.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Provide hands-on materials (i.e. markers, manipulatives, white boards, etc.) for teachers to use during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the year and ongoing

Title I funded additional classroom teacher and classroom assistants to reduce overall classroom size.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

All mathematics classrooms will display accurate images, graphics, symbols, contextual or other renderings of mathematical quantities and relationships.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter

Developing classroom engagement kits for active participation.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year and ongoing

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the ESSA subgroup data summary, we will focus (an increase on math proficiency, reading proficiency and outlook on school) on students with disabilities, students who are black, and students who qualify for free or reduced lunch. All three of the subgroups mentioned above fall below the threshold of 41% performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase each subgroup by the amount necessary to remove them from a position below the 41% threshold. This will require an increase of 10 percent for SWD, 5 percent for students who are black and 3 percent for students who qualify for free or reduced lunch.

Monitoring:

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

We will access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data for Math and Reading. We will monitor outlook on school through the use of monthly student survey data, climate surveys, and parent surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

For Math and Reading we will engage in Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement. In order to increase student outlook on school we will develop predictable routines, define and teach positive expectations, engage students in relevant learning, design a safe school environment, and promote high positivity within the classroom environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All students will track data using grade-level developed common methods.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Subgroup students will engage in data chats with teachers on a grade appropriate level to gain understanding of their performance and set goals.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: After PM1 and PM2

All faculty and classroom assistants will participate in professional development and collaborative planning for small-group instructional best practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Provide hands-on materials (i.e. markers, manipulatives, white boards, etc.) for teachers to use during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year and ongoing

Title I funded additional classroom teacher and classroom assistants to reduce overall classroom size.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

All teachers and staff will establish a campus and classroom culture of inclusion and respect that welcomes all students.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

Teachers, staff, and school counselor will explicitly link desired character traits and values to academic progress and success.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be ELA/Reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Reading proficiency from 33% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

We will access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our evidenced based interventions include the following: Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All reading teachers will administer baseline student assessments i.e. PM1, PM2, etc. using chromebooks and headphones.

Person Responsible: Shadreka Smith (shadreka.smith@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of September and January.

Collect and analyze data from school and District based assessments at a minimum of five (5) times per annum to inform instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of the year.

All students will track data using grade-level developed common methods.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

All faculty and classroom assistants will participate in professional development and collaborative planning for small-group instructional best practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the year

An instructional coach will support professional learning communities, and direct coaching to instructional staff regarding lesson structure, and implementation, remediation, etc.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Title 1 funded additional classroom assistants to increase coverage and engagement within small groups.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year and ongoing

All ELA/Reading teachers will use pictures, sketches, webs, maps images, graphics, symbols, contextual or other renderings to help readers make their thinking visible.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All ELA/Reading teachers will show how reading, English, and language arts content domains progress.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All ELA/Reading teachers will use anchor charts to communicate reading, English, or language arts ideas in a variety of concepts.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Developing classroom engagement kits for active participation.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Students will use active modalities to demonstrate mastery.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the 2022/2023 school year only 51% of students identified that they liked coming to school everyday. We believe that outlook directly contributed to the high rates of chronic absenteeism and low rates of daily attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase the percentage of students that like coming to school everyday from 51% to 80%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this through the use of monthly student survey data, climate surveys, and parent surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In order to increase student outlook we will develop predictable routines, define and teach positive expectations, engage students in relevant learning, design a safe school environment, and promote high positivity within the classroom environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that a positive outlook toward school will increase students' active participation in the classroom and promote stronger attendance school-wide. We believe that we will also see a decline in the actions that result in the reduction of instructional participation due to misbehavior and off task behavior among all sub-groups.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All classroom teacher conducts predictable and welcoming morning routines.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Daily

Create, print, and publish visual artifacts to reinforce predictable routines.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

Full-time preventionist to lead key campus initiatives to include after-hour planning and implementation for day-one instruction.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the year

The PBIS team will define and publish campus-wide behaviors that promote academic progress.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

Coordinator of Title 1 & Student Success, School Counselor, and assistants will promote cooperation, perspective-taking, peer mediation, conflict management and resolution, restorative practices, and compliance.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers, staff, and school counselor will explicitly link desired character traits and values to academic progress and success.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All teachers and staff will establish a campus and classroom culture of inclusion and respect that welcomes all students.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

The PBIS team will recognize and reward faculty, staff, students, and parents/guardians when they show progress toward, meet, exceed, or role model expectations.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

All teachers will make positive student and or parent contacts using postcards and phone calls, and document in Synergy.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

At the beginning of our planning process our leadership team reviewed the previous use of funds and how resources have previously been allocated. Additionally, we reviewed student performance on state assessments, both overall and by subgroup. We then connected with stakeholders to gather information and input. Based on our review, we believed it best to allocate the largest portion of our funds through Title 1 to additional staff. We have included an additional third grade teacher and a student success coordinator. Additionally, we have increased the student contact time for current support staff and instructional assistants. Additional funding has been allocated to support the purchase of resources that align to our current reading

and math curriculum, and support our schoolwide PBIS plan. Additionally, we have allocated funds to support tutoring and after school academic preparation. Finally, we have allocated funds to support the purchase of additional technology for classroom use by students to support instruction.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Fewer than 50% of students in Kindergarten through 2nd grade have not met level 3 proficiency on the STAR Measures ELA assessment. The ELA scores from the 22/23 STAR are as follows: KG - 51% fell below benchmark, 1st - 61% fell below benchmark, 2nd - 51% fell below benchmark.

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

Fewer than 50% of students in grades 3 through 5 have have not met level 3 proficiency on the PM3 Reading assessment. The scores from the 22/23 PM3 are as follows: 3rd - 69% scored 1 or 2, 4th - 70% scored 1 or 2, 5th - 71% scored 1 or 2.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Please note our grade specific goals below for the 23/24 school year:

KG - From 51% to fewer than 37%, 1st - From 61% to fewer than 37%, 2nd - From 51% to fewer than 37% falling below benchmark.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Please note our grade specific goals below for the 23/24 school year:

3rd - From 69% scoring 1/2 to fewer than 50%, 4th - From 70% scoring 1/2 to fewer than 50%, 5th - From 71% scoring 1/2 to fewer than 50%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

We will access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, STAR data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data. We will continue to monitor formative student performance and how that performance impacts corrective instruction. We will utilize our District support in the form of curriculum specialists, reading coaches and new teacher coaches to continue to build teacher capacity and efficacy as we monitor instructional practice.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jones , Justin, justin.jones@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Our evidenced based interventions include the following for all grade levels Kindergarten through 6th grade: Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which

students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support. Individual and small group instruction ensures that students can receive the specific support and corrective instruction they need. Additionally, research indicates that active classroom engagement will encourage a greater connection from the learner and support the retention of standards based instruction.

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
<p>We will utilize Literacy Leadership Team comprised of our MTSS Coordinator, Administration, Student Success Coordinator, Media Specialist, an ELA lead teacher and an ESE Support Facilitator to ensure that we are frequently reviewing and monitoring student performance, and how we are responding to literacy achievement gaps.</p>	<p>Jones , Justin, justin.jones@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>We are providing an additional focus for our staff on Professional Learning by creating opportunities for targeted ELA teachers to participate in Corrective Reading Training and Spelling through Morphographs training. Both of these programs are designed to provide a greater intensity of support to students with deficiencies in reading. Additionally, our instructional support staff are working toward micro-credentialing through the Lastinger Center which will allow them to provide additional academic intervention through the use of targeted small groups.</p>	<p>Jones , Justin, justin.jones@myoneclay.net</p>

Clay County Schools

Keystone Heights Junior/ Senior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khh.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all students. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous and relevant; which transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

KHHS exists to prepare lifelong learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and to help them acquire applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burke, Laurie	Principal	
Underwood, Barry	Assistant Principal	
Rodriguez, Melanie	Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Spencer	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process of developing the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan included the collaboration of the school leadership team, our Title 1 Coordinator, our District Title 1 Curriculum Specialist, and our School Advisory Council, which includes teachers, students, and business partners. Their input was used to help build our goals based on our student data.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The progress monitoring of our SIP will be based on student PM1, PM2, and PM3 FAST data, student attendance, and student achievement based on subgroups. Our SAC team will meet quarterly to discuss our progress in meeting our goals and develop new strategies if needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	12%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	48	102	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	72	147	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	10	29	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	58	97	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	18	37	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	106	221	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	18	52

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days									31	35	186
One or more suspensions									13	13	63
Course failure in ELA									0	0	
Course failure in Math									0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment									38	51	233
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment									25	39	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.									39	44	229

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	316

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	35	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	39	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	44	83

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	111

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	46			47			52		
ELA Learning Gains	41			38			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29			30			45		
Math Achievement*	55			47			59		
Math Learning Gains	47			36			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37			24			40		
Science Achievement*	59			58			58		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*	65			70			70		
Middle School Acceleration	62			49			72		
Graduation Rate	87			93			92		
College and Career Acceleration	61			70			71		
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	87

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	43			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	41	29	55	47	37	59	65	62	87	61	
SWD	21	26	21	29	36	29	36	45	23	81	20	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	43		7	36			60				
HSP	37	30	17	45	48	46	69	54				
MUL	40	44		67	47			62				
PAC												
WHT	47	41	28	56	48	38	58	66	62	88	64	
FRL	38	38	23	44	43	41	51	60	55	82	56	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	38	30	47	36	24	58	70	49	93	70	
SWD	21	31	26	22	29	28	28	42	16	87	33	
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	32	20	22	10		36					
HSP	42	43		29	37	0	47	67	30	90		
MUL	36	32		67	50		33					
PAC												
WHT	47	38	29	49	37	27	60	72	50	93	70	
FRL	38	32	25	39	36	23	52	70	34	87	57	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	52	45	59	49	40	58	70	72	92	71	
SWD	24	41	32	27	41	38	32	40		91	41	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	35	30	53	62		46					
HSP	45	63	70	50	54		67	92				
MUL	30	60		47	44		19					
PAC												
WHT	54	51	42	60	48	38	59	70	72	91	72	
FRL	42	48	45	56	47	42	51	60	70	90	60	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Students in 7th grade Math had the lowest proficiency rating, 37%, compared to the other grade levels and schools in the district. Trends show that this same 7th-grade cohort also had the lowest ELA proficiency rating (39%) compared to our other grade levels and schools in the district. Looking at attendance and behavior data for this same 7th-grade cohort, it shows that 54 students have been absent 10 or more days to school; and 75 students have one or more suspensions.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline of 3 points from the prior year is the 7th grade ELA dropping from 43% proficiency to 39% proficiency. Factors that contribute to this decline are the high level of discipline and attendance concerns in this 7th-grade cohort, as well as, the lack of instructional support provided to our students in our 7th-grade inclusion classrooms.

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.

The state average for 7th grade Math is 48%, and KHHS 7th grade proficiency is 37% an 11-point discrepancy. Trends show this same cohort is low in all areas compared to other grade levels. They also have a higher discipline rate and higher attendance issues.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is our 8th grade ELA increase of 9 points in one year from 39% proficiency to 48% proficiency. New actions that took place in the school year to contribute to this increase, were the teachers' willingness to focus their instruction on the BEST standards and incorporate a collaborative style of instruction utilizing the practice of standard-based questions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data, two areas of concern are attendance and ELA proficiency.

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

ELA Proficiency
Math Proficiency
Attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST/ACT/SAT data, our area of focus will be ELA. By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Reading Proficiency from 45.75% to over 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Reading Proficiency from 45.75 to over 50% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use Fast PM1, 2, and 3 data to progress monitor student baseline, mid-year, and end-of-the-year growth. Lexia will also be used to help us follow student achievement levels, and see what levels they need specific instruction in to help close gaps. We will be able to utilize both of these measures to monitor where our students need support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use direct-explicit instruction in the ELA/Reading classes and provide small group instruction as needed for students and give immediate feedback. Teachers will use explicit vocabulary instruction and provide frequent student practice in class. Teachers will use visual representations as needed for all students. KHH will provide tutoring outside of the normal school day and Saturday school as needed. Teachers will be provided professional development on how to build teacher efficacy using the co-teach model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using all of the above strategies will allow teachers to work with all of the students to meet their needs. The research in Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices, says "teachers should provide adolescents with direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies to improve students' reading comprehension. Comprehension strategies are routines and procedures that readers use to help them make sense of texts." Providing students with small groups for guided practice and immediate feedback will help with their confidence in Reading. Allowing them extra time and support outside of school hours will also allow for this confidence to show.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. District ELA Specialists/Coaches to hold Professional Development on "Direct-Explicit Instruction".
2. Reading coach supporting ELA teachers in instruction.
3. Use Vocabulary.com as a resource to monitor student progress.
4. Utilize supplemental reading materials to increase Reading interest in small groups.
5. Utilize a teacher assistant to support small group instruction.
6. Hold quarterly data meetings.
7. Use data to monitor progress in creating targeted small groups.
8. Use the Small Group Reading Instructional Professional Development book as a book study for PD.
9. Use Wireless Quiz Busser System and Nearpods as an engagement tool.
10. Students use Lexia PowerUp and other district-approved online programs.
11. Providing materials to help with classroom walk-throughs and observations.
12. Use of visual models - posters, etc.
13. Whiteboards for teacher walls in classrooms.
14. Use SMORES as a way of communication between school and home.
15. Interactive T.V.s and Chromebooks to support engagement.

Person Responsible: Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

By When: Each quarter Mrs. Rodriguez will review the action steps that are being used at KHH.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math. By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase overall math achievement from 51.25% to 59% by the end of the 2023--2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase overall math achievement from 51.25% to 59% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use PM 1, 2, and 3 data to progress monitor student baseline, mid-year, and end-of-the-year growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use small group instruction as needed and give immediate feedback. Teachers will use visual representations as needed and provide frequent student practice with math problems. Teachers will model for students the expected academic achievement. KHH will provide tutoring outside of the normal school day and Saturday school as needed. Teachers will be provided professional development on how to build teacher efficacy using the co-teach model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the above strategies will allow teachers to work with all students to meet their needs. Research in the article, Enhancing Core Mathematics Instruction for Students At Risk for Mathematics Disabilities, reads "that the experimental intervention research supports the notion of making core mathematics instruction more systematic and explicit for students that are at risk of mathematics disability." This evidence-based intervention can be used in small groups providing that explicit instruction to a small group of students who are struggling or may not understand a concept. Students will receive immediate feedback from their teachers. The research in, Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4-8, reads to "model how to monitor and reflect on the problem-solving process." Teachers will model as they solve problems so that students can use the same strategy as they are solving independently. Allowing them extra time and support outside of school hours will also allow for this confidence to grow.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. District Support in small group instruction, PD, and model lessons.
2. Collaborative lesson planning through common planning opportunities.
3. Utilize data to monitor progress for small groups.
4. Conduct data meetings quarterly to address areas of concern.
5. Small Group instruction
6. PD book study Making Sense of Mathematics for Teaching the Small Group.
7. Formative and Summative Assessments.
8. Incorporate IXL to use for model instruction and for additional practice.
9. Use visuals aids for teaching and supplemental materials
10. Use SMORES for communication between school and home. And opportunities for parent/teacher conferences.
11. Whiteboards for classrooms with chalkboards for problem-solving.
12. Interactive T.V.s and Chromebooks for student engagement.
13. Provide scientific calculators
14. Offer tutoring for extra support. Provide Transportation as needed.
15. Provide summer school for students who are not proficient in 3rd progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

By When: Each quarter Mrs. Burke will review the action steps that are being used at KHH.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on Synergy data, our area of focus will be Student Life Skills. By using the strategies and action plan described below we will increase Student attendance from 89.89% to 92% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below we will increase Student attendance from 89.89% to 92% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

It begins with the teachers. Teachers take daily attendance in all of their classes. From there when students are absent three days in one month, the teacher calls the parent. Student misses 5 days, the teacher completes a form to notify the administration. Student misses 10 days (within 90 day period), the attendance Student Success Team will meet to work with families and determine the cause of absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Faculty and staff will establish positive connections with students through engaging/active classrooms. KHH will foster student expectations of success at the beginning of the school year in grade-level assemblies. KHH will provide meaningful two-way communication between school and family.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the Center of PBS guide, research shows teachers need to establish a positive connection with students, families, and other educators. When we establish these connections, students in return will feel connected to their teachers or peers. Families will feel connected by receiving information via email, in person, social media, or positive phone calls from home. Research says teachers need to engage students in relevant learning. Most students do not like to sit in a boring classroom. Students are more up to come to school if their classes are more engaging. Teaching students positive expectations at the beginning of the school year sets them up for success!

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. First-period teachers will contact the parents of their students and hold one conference with them.
2. Positive notes home.
3. High Expectations of students.
4. Attendance posters around school campus
5. Pancake Breakfast - rewards for no absences and no tardies.
6. Utilize WEB program (Where Everyone Belongs) Anti-Bullying
7. Utilize Hall Pass - digital program allowing teachers to see if too many students are out using the restroom already.
8. Use 7 Mindsets
9. Administration sharing important phone calls home through robo calls or individual phone calls home. Sharing school newsletters on social media.
10. Transportation as needed for parents to attend parent events.
11. PD on engaging lessons
12. Utilize the Indian Buck when students show one of our characteristics traits: STRONG- S = Shows Up, T = Working Together, R = Giving Respect, O = Taking Ownership, N = Never Give UP, G = Using Grit

Person Responsible: Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

By When: Each quarter Mrs. Burke will review the action steps that are being used at KHH.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process by which our school will review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on need is by incorporating the collaboration of our School Advisory Council, Community Partnership School, Guidance, Teachers, Parents, and Students in the decision-making process. Some resources we will utilize this year for school improvement will be funded through Title 1, as well as, our Community Partnership Schools. During our first SAC meeting, we will approve our SIP and collaborate to review resources and address allocations based on student needs. Some resources that will be discussed but not limited to are; per-pupil expenditures, instructional time, early intervention, teacher quality, school leadership quality, facilities and rigorous content/courses, and specialized instructional support personnel. Each of these factors contributes to student success and will be discussed to determine which identifying intervention or activity will have the greatest impact on improving our area of focus.

Clay County Schools

Keystone Heights Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Keystone Heights Elementary

335 SW PECAN ST, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khe.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Keystone Heights Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

Turbeville, Beth	Principal	Gather the SIP team together and to facilitate the process of completing and implementing the year-long school improvement plan for 2023-2024.
------------------	-----------	--

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team first began by disaggregating our school data and ruminating on the data in late May and early June. We began to formulate some ideas about our vision for improvement based upon the data. We met with the SAC committee in May 2023 and discussed our vision. The school leadership team put our plan into full "action steps" in collaboration with our SAC committee on August 14, 2023. Our school improvement goals were developed and our vision to implementation steps as a result

The school leadership team consisted of Principal Beth Turbeville, Assistant Principal Kayleigh Williams, Assistant Principal Cory Stone, Math/Science Coach Brandi Kirkland and Former Title 1 Lead Missy Gillenwaters. Once we moved into collaboration with our school SAC committee, the following individuals were also included in decision making for our SIP plan: (new) Title 1 Lead Megan Slater, (Parent) Shelly Alvers, (Parent) Jenna Langford, (Parent) Brittany McCall, (Parent) Jackie Huntley, (Teacher) Eric Scamahorn, (Teacher) Ebonie Bennett, (Teacher) Selina Jones, (Teacher) Liz Gamsby, (Parent) Shannon Tisdale, (Principals Secretary & Bookkeeper) Shannon Bishop.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our school improvement goals were presented to our faculty, along with our plan for improvement for the 2023-2024 school year. It will be regularly monitored through five (5) collaborative data meetings between teachers, content coaches, and administration throughout the school year. The first data meeting was held during pre-planning. The group looked at last year's summative data and then took some time to look forward with the students teachers will be teaching to formulate a plan based on their student data. After PM1, during the first week in October, teachers, coaches and administration, will meet again to look at our school improvement goals, create learning target plans, and analyze student data to check for alignment with SIP goals. Collaboratively, plans will be made for differentiation and remediation for instruction to continue to align students to SIP goals. During this and future meetings, the opportunity for revised plans to ensure for continuous improvement will be a must. Data meetings will occur once again in January and March after PM2 and Quarter 3 to continue this process of analyzing data, checking for alignment with SIP goals and formulating plans for interventions and remediation of standards and skills. One final data meeting will be held during the last week of school to discuss how students ended the school year after analyzing data from PM3. A final check for an alignment with the SIP goals will provide the feedback needed on our level of success.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	11%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	31	24	16	25	24	28	26	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	7	11	14	16	19	33	22	0	0	122
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	6	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	25	34	18	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	18	42	9	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	12	28	40	0	0	89
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	11	2	3	9	13	29	17	0	0	84

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	20	16	15	17	18	21	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	9	4	3	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	31	13	17	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	16	16	15	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	18	30	22	31	13	17	0	0	145

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	8	7	5	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	20	16	15	17	18	21	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	9	4	3	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	31	13	17	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	16	16	15	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	14	18	30	22	31	13	17	0	0	145

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	8	7	5	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56			71			68		
ELA Learning Gains	47			66			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42			52			49		
Math Achievement*	71			78			80		
Math Learning Gains	71			73			76		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58			68			68		
Science Achievement*	62			69			79		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	61			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	47	42	71	71	58	62					
SWD	35	34	29	53	58	48	44					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	58	50		63	72							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	46	39	72	71	54	63					
FRL	45	46	40	59	63	53	51					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	66	52	78	73	68	69					
SWD	53	50	41	63	67	58	42					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			60								
HSP	77	70		82	60							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	66	51	78	73	67	68					
FRL	64	57	17	69	65	63	60					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	58	49	80	76	68	79					
SWD	49	48	42	57	57	54	70					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	50		56	69							
HSP	67	57		81	78							
MUL	91			100								
PAC												
WHT	68	58	49	80	75	67	80					
FRL	65	59	53	74	72	64	75					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 school's lowest performance was in reading with 53% proficiency. Contributing factors to low performance could possibly include 67 students with a substantial reading deficiency who received intensive interventions starting in January, post-covid instability, and a 4% increase in economically disadvantaged students from the previous year.

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

5th grade math showed the greatest decline with 39% proficiency in 2023 from 60% proficiency in 2022. One of our math teachers took an extended leave of absence due to a family emergency, and despite a strong substitute teacher and an intervention plan provided by a push-in teacher, the students struggled to learn grade level content.

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.

5th grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with 39% proficiency as compared to the state with 55% proficiency. Our 5th grade data in ELA and math were our weakest across the board.

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

4th grade ELA showed the most improvement from 2022 with 46% to 62% in 2023 (a 16 point increase in proficiency). We had a new teacher who taught all content who showed high scores, along with another new teacher to 4th grade who moved up from 3rd grade who is strong with a history of strong test scores.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

We had 122 students with 1 or more suspensions (ISS and/or OSS) during 2022-2023. We are taking a proactive approach to restorative discipline by updating our discipline flowchart. We also provided some training and collaboration with teachers on classroom expectations in an effort to be proactive with starting off the year with explicit expectations. Our goal is to reduce suspensions by 50%.

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

1. Reduce the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency
2. Increase the number of students who are achieving in math and reading with proficiency
3. Increase the number of students in subgroups who are achieving in math and reading with proficiency
4. Reduce the number of suspensions on our campus by 50% or more
5. Increase our attendance percentage to 95% present while reducing tardies, as well.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Using our school FAST data, KHE will focus on ELA Achievement for ALL students. From 2021/2022 to 2022/2023 we stayed stagnant by only increasing overall achievement by .25%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus is reading. By using the strategies and the action plan as described in our school improvement plan, we will increase reading proficiency from 53% to 60% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Meeting with teachers in five data meetings throughout the school year to analyze progress monitoring data through state and local assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use explicit comprehension Instruction in tier I and small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students that have been taught multiple, explicit, comprehension strategies will demonstrate greater improvement in reading comprehension.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Using our school data from the FAST, KHE will focus on math achievement for ALL students. From 2021/2022 to 2022/2023 math achievement went down 4.75% in proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be math. By using the strategies and action plan in our school improvement plan, we will increase our math proficiency from 61% to 70% during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Meeting with teachers in five data meetings throughout the school year to analyze progress monitoring data through state and local assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use instructional scaffolding and small group instruction to improve Math proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional scaffolding and small group instruction implemented in combination provide supports and specific instruction to develop skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Using our NGSSS Assessment, our scores dropped 3% from 2022 to 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on NGSSSA data, our area of focus will be science. By using the strategies and action plan in our school improvement plan, we will increase our NGSSS Assessment in the area of Nature of Science from 60% to 70% during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Meeting with teachers in five data meetings throughout the school year to analyze progress monitoring data through state and local assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Turbeville (elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Inquiry based lessons will be implemented across all grade levels to improve school Science learning and ultimately improve state assessment scores.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Inquiry or experimental based learning, involves gaining knowledge and skills through activities rather than passive learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on Synergy data, our area of focus will be classroom management. By using the strategies and actions in the school improvement plan, we will increase positive, clear and consistent classroom expectations to increase our Benchmarks of Quality in the classroom from 50% to 75% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through walkthrough data input through continuous walkthroughs from administration via the district walkthrough dashboard and through the PBIS walkthrough by Kristi Gomez at the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kayleigh Williams (kayleigh.williams@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive, proactive behavior practices will be implemented in a schoolwide framework with consistent use throughout the campus to reduce discipline incidents on the school campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The effectiveness of positive, proactive behavior practices are most effective when implemented in schoolwide framework.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Kindergarten - Teachers will focus on letter naming upper and lower case letters. They will teach beginning, middle and last sound in words. They will teach high frequency words. They will work on students writing letters correctly.

First Grade - Teachers will teach students to sound out and write simple words with short vowel sounds, final -e, common long vowel spellings, blends and r-controlled vowels. Teachers will teach high frequency words, decodable or not with automaticity. Teachers will teach writing all letters correctly.

Second Grade - Teachers will teach decoding words with complex combinations (e.g., oo,ea,ou,oi,oy,ow). They will teach decoding words with common prefixes and suffixes.

All of these instructional practices are part of the BEST standards and will provide our students an education where they will be successful in the future. We used our Lexia data to help support our reasons for choosing practices we want our teachers to focus on in class with students.

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

Third Grade - Teachers will teach decoding multisyllabic words and words with suffixes such as -ful, -less, and -est. They will teach grade appropriate vocabulary in both speaking and writing. Teachers will teach, summarizing, characters and plot, text features, main idea and details, compare and contrast, along with figurative language.

Fifth Grade - Teachers will teach grade level phonics and word analysis skills to read and write single-syllable and multisyllabic words. Teachers will teach summarizing texts, main idea and details, text features, analyze setting, events, and plot. Teachers will teach how students figure meanings of unknown words using context clues, figurative language, word relationships, and background knowledge.

All of these instructional practices are part of the BEST standards and will provide our students an education where they will be successful in the future. We used our last year FSA data to see where we need to improve as a school. Third grade was 51% proficient and fifth grade was 43% proficient.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Kindergarten teachers will administer Dibels/ Acadience, Lexia, and STAR Renaissance Early Literacy and STAR Reading.

1st and 2nd grade will administer Lexia, STAR Renaissance Early Literacy, and STAR Reading.

Kindergarten will improve from 25% to 70% on Grade level material in Lexia.

1st Grade will improve from 20% to 65% on Grade level material in Lexia.

2nd Grade will improve from 18% to 65% on Grade level material in Lexia.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, our school will meet the following outcomes:

Using FAST data:

Fifth grade ELA will improve from 53% to 60% proficient.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Meet collaboratively with teachers, coaches and administration in five data meetings throughout the year to align school improvement goals with progress monitoring data through Lexia, STAR Reading, STAR Math, and FAST Assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Teachers will implement district curriculum to its fullest. All curriculum will be aligned with the district reading plan, school improvement goals and vision. Teachers will teach the BEST ELA Standards daily, placing their learning targets with success criteria visibly for students to see and for teachers to refer to. The following curriculum will be used: Kid Lips, Heggerty, SAVAAS, Lexia Core 5 and Corrective Reading as needed. Teachers will teach, model, provide scaffolding, and provide differentiated small groups based on student need. Students will receive explicit comprehension instruction along with phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction. Students will be provided with frequent practice that can be monitored by teachers in small groups. Deliberate linkage will be placed between reading and writing.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

We will follow the 2023-2024 CCDS K-12 VPK-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan (CERP). Our school-based instructional plan is aligned to the district plan. Adhering to the district curriculum will provide our teachers with the tools they need to teach our students to reach proficiency. Our school district approves evidence based curriculum that has been proven success.

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
Literacy Leadership- Implement monthly literacy team meetings to ensure our school is on track with ELA school improvement goal alignment.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Literacy Leadership-Provide Professional Development in the area of Literacy for Faculty and Staff	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Literacy Leadership- Lead, plan and orrganize five (5) Collaborative Data Meetings Throughout the Year to Analyze Progress Monitoring Data and to Strategize/Plan for Differentiated Instruction Based on Data	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Literacy Coaching- Through Title 1 Funding and guidance through our New Teacher Support District Lead Coach, mentor teachers are paired with new teachers on our campus to provide literacy coaching in an effort to retain new teachers at KHE.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Assessment- Teachers will collaborate to build formative assessments during PLC's that are aligned with the FAST state assessments.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net
Professional Learning- The district Literacy Curriculum Coaches will provide ongoing professional learning throughout the 23/24 school year for teachers to support SIP literacy goals.	Turbeville, Beth, elizabeth.turbeville@myoneclay.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our school improvement plan will be disseminated through our SAC committee. It will also be made available through our Title 1 information on our school website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.
 List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our school builds positive relationships through Parent/Family Engagement Nights at KHE. We will have a Game/Trivia Night in October, a STEM Night in February, a Daddy/Daughter Dance in April and a Mom/Son Date Night in April. We also have a Volunteer Initiative and allow parents to eat lunch with their students each day. We have a "hostess" in our cafeteria who facilitates this process to make the visiting experience a delightful one. During pre-planning, every teacher made mandatory phone calls home to every parent to welcome them/their child back to school, as well. The Family Engagement Plan will be made available on our school website and through our SAC committee meeting agenda in September, as well.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

This year, we have a larger cafetorium with double the seating for students at one time. We are able to use less staff over the course of the day supervising students for lunch and more staff helping in classrooms. We also shortened recess to 20 minutes and maximized every minute on our master schedule. We begin announcements 5 minutes earlier to give instruction an earlier start. Administration was strategic with teacher placement and scheduling.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school counselors will be providing mandatory classroom instruction throughout the 2023-2024 school year. Additionally, students have opportunities through clubs after hours at KHE to find enjoyment through such as the Art Club, Chorus, and Robotics.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our school implements PBIS and focuses on restorative discipline practices. We have a discipline flow chart that explicitly describes the path teachers and staff should follow when taking action to discipline students. Our school-wide PBIS Rewards is a strong Tier 1 program that our school uses.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The Clay County School District provides new teacher support coaches who visit and provide support to new teachers once a week at KHE. Our school provides "Indian Guides" as mentors who pair with new teachers and "new to KHE teachers" to help them adjust and acclimate to KHE. This is done in an effort to retain effective teachers at KHE.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our school works with Child Find to assist in acquiring children from local daycare centers and helping them transition into pre-k.

Clay County Schools

Lake Asbury Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	19

Lake Asbury Elementary School

2901 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://lae.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to increase the academic achievement of all students. Lake Asbury Elementary, working collaboratively with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Our teachers will provide rigorous and relevant learning opportunities for each child to experience academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Asbury Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and a diverse society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Butcher, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Responsibilities as an inclusion teacher are the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students in order to contribute to the goals of our SIP.
Petelli, Treena	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responding to student discipline issues and other operational functions of the school.
Hanson, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	Responsibilities as an ESE teacher are the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students in order to contribute to the goals of our SIP.
Roche, Heather	Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responding to student discipline issues and other operational functions of the school.
Ehlinger, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responding to student discipline issues and other operational functions of the school.
Halter, Jonathan	Teacher, K-12	Establish a safe, respectful and inclusive classroom climate conducive to learning. In addition to maintaining a growth mindset toward student learning, teaching practice, and personal/collective professional development.
Milla, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	Establish a safe, respectful and inclusive classroom climate conducive to learning. In addition to maintaining a growth mindset toward student learning, teaching practice, and personal/collective professional development.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We ensured that we had members from every stakeholder group were involved in creating our SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will regularly be monitored by ongoing walkthroughs in classrooms and data will be discussed during data chats with grade level and ESE teachers monthly where data is shared and analyzed to monitor progress for our students to ensure gaps are being closed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	42%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	18	21	17	14	20	30	27	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	10	9	15	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	9	22	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	12	12	15	0	0	44

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	10	10	9	15	0	46

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	18	21	17	14	20	30	27	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	10	9	15	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	9	22	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	12	12	15	0	0	44

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	18	21	17	14	20	30	27	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	10	9	15	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	9	22	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	12	12	15	0	0	44

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68			63			64		
ELA Learning Gains	62			58			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54			41			43		
Math Achievement*	75			68			71		
Math Learning Gains	78			60			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70			46			45		
Science Achievement*	73			70			68		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK	70			
HSP	66			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	62	54	75	78	70	73					
SWD	43	56	43	56	65	55	41					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67	64	54	67	82	82	75					
HSP	53	68		60	76		75					
MUL	83	72		87	95							
PAC												
WHT	69	61	52	77	77	66	71					
FRL	50	47	31	59	70	68	45					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	58	41	68	60	46	70					
SWD	32	45	27	44	47	35	44					
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			51	54							
HSP	70	67		66	65		67					
MUL	68	64		68	57							
PAC												
WHT	65	58	47	71	60	41	74					
FRL	55	56	42	56	51	44	74					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	61	43	71	63	45	68					
SWD	40	42	30	49	49	40	48					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	55	56	50	50	35	20					
HSP	74	76		67	63		79					
MUL	64	56		64	56							
PAC												
WHT	66	60	37	75	65	49	74					
FRL	59	56	41	62	56	37	62					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The lowest data component was in ELA. Contributing factors were a new state testing system, new processes for providing interventions, and new curriculum.

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

Based on the data, our ELA lowest quartile growth remains our greatest area of need. Although our scholars improved from 48% to 54% from the school years 2022 to 2023, we would like to see an increase in proficiency for this group.

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.

Although we showed a gain in our ELA lower quartile growth, this remains our lowest area. We will continue to incorporate intensive interventions for our lower quartile scholars. We continue to focus on small group instruction based on data collected through professional learning communities as well as classroom formative assessments.

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

The area that was most improved for us is our math lower quartile with a 24 point increase from the 2022 to the 2023 school year. There was more consistency with delivering small group differentiated instruction. There were longer blocks of time with the ESE teachers pushing into the math classrooms.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is attendance. We had 147 students in grades K-6 that were absent 10% or more days. If our scholars are not present at school and receiving instruction, our progress diminishes.

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

1. Increasing ELA proficiency for our lowest 25% of students in all grade levels
2. Increasing ELA proficiency for all scholars
3. Increasing Math proficiency for our lowest 25% in all grade levels
4. Increasing Math proficiency for all scholars
5. Increasing attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 2023 FAST PM 3 results showed that 60% of our students were proficient in ELA, with 40% below grade level or non-proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the percentage of students proficient in ELA as measured on the FAST PM 3 assessment from 60% to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student growth using the following data sets: FAST PM 1 to PM 2, Lexia, and curriculum based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will implement small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted curriculum to include Savvas, Lexia Core 5, From Phonics to Reading, and other approved materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With increased rigor and implementation of grade level appropriate materials, our students will show improvement in the area of ELA.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach BEST ELA standards with the grade level expectation of rigor. Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

Person Responsible: Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the past several years since 2020, attendance has become optional. We are using tangible incentives as well as creating excitement for scholars surrounding learning. We are also continuing our student success team meetings to work with families to increase scholar attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will run a Synergy report every 4-1/2 weeks to monitor our grade levels' attendance rate. Our goal will be to continue to increase our percentage of students at school. The end goal will be to have 95% of students attending school.

Monitoring:

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

LAE Attendance Team will meet monthly on the first Thursday of the month. The attendance team consists of the records secretary, social worker, and administrator. Input is provided by teachers via a Google Form and in the Contact Log of Synergy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Treena Petelli (treena.petelli@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Creating a positive school and class environment will impact the will of students for attending school. We will use positive reinforcements, recognition, and family positive notes. This year we have also increased opportunities for activities (art club, robotics, music) which we hope to create experiences students will not want to miss.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As shared by Attendance Works, schools can increase attendance by creating a welcoming environment that emphasizes building relationships with families and stresses the importance of going to class every day. "The key is developing a school-wide school culture that promotes a sense of safety, respect and personal responsibility, where students feel connected and know that someone notices, in a caring manner, when they missed school."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Recognize when students are consistently present. Students with attendance of 95% or higher for each nine weeks will be awarded: certificate at awards ceremony, backpack attendance tags, and a thank you note for parents.

Person Responsible: Treena Petelli (treena.petrelli@myoneclay.net)

By When: Classrooms will be recognized every 4-1/2 weeks for having the highest attendance compared to the classes in their grade level.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

The students in grades K-2 will be given the Acadience screener in September, January and April.

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

The students in grades 3-5 that score a level one on their PM 1 assessment (23-24, 3rd grade) and their PM 3 assessment (22-23, 4-5) will be given the Corrective Reading baseline assessment. These students will be given a progress monitoring assessment every 10 lessons to track their progress with the lessons. The lessons will be administered in small groups with other students at their levels.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

In our previous school year, our 1st grade scholars which are now 2nd graders, had 50 percent or more students who were shown to not be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. We will layer in supported learning with state supports as a Universal school and district support for coaches/specialist to provide training. We will implement Phonics to Reading, Heggerty, Kid Lips, and SAVAAS with fidelity so our 2nd grade students show an increase in proficiency on their state progress monitoring assessments. For PM 3, our goal is to have all 2nd grade student proficient in ELA.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The 2nd graders will be assessed using Acadience at the beginning of the school year, again in January and then again in April. We will monitor their progress with this resource as well as PM 1 to PM 2 and PM 1 to PM 3 to progress monitor our scholars.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Roche, Heather, heather.roche@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Implementing Phonics to Reading, Heggerty, Kid Lips and SAVAAS with fidelity does satisfy the needs of using evidence-based resources that are approved by our district and align with the BEST ELA Standards very closely.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The resources mentioned above address the ELA needs of our 2nd graders. These are evidence-based resources so they are proven to show effectiveness for struggling readers.

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
Identify the students that are struggling because we have 3 new administrators at LAE this school year. We will analyze the data from last school year with the PM 1 data just received.	Roche, Heather, heather.roche@myoneclay.net
We will have data chats with our 2nd grade teachers to discuss the data and identify as a team who our struggling readers are.	Petelli, Treena, treena.petrelli@myoneclay.net
Devise a schedule for Acadience testing and assign a testing administrator to each classroom. Share a spreadsheet for each 2nd grade teacher to input their student data.	Ehlinger, Jessica, jessica.ehlinger@myoneclay.net
Teachers implement evidence-based resources with the layering of supported learning with state supports as a Universal school and district support for coaches/ specialist to provide training on how to effectively implement these resources.	Roche, Heather, heather.roche@myoneclay.net
Monitor the progress of our 2nd grade students to ensure they are making progress.	Petelli, Treena, treena.petrelli@myoneclay.net
Admin conducting frequent walk-throughs to support and guide 2nd grade teachers.	Roche, Heather, heather.roche@myoneclay.net

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	19

Lake Asbury Junior High School

2851 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://laj.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant, and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Creel, Lydia	Principal	Analyzes data and works with teams to develop goals for LAJH based on historical academic, behavioral, and social emotional learning progress to improve learning outcomes for all students.
Umbaugh, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Analyzes data and works with teams to develop goals for LAJH based on historical academic, behavioral, and social emotional learning progress.
Davis, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Analyzes data and works with teams to develop goals for LAJH based on historical academic, behavioral, and social emotional learning progress.
Cascanet, Sara	SAC Member	Dual Certified teacher serving as a parent, liaison, club sponsor, and SAC Committee member assisting other committee members and stakeholders in understanding school initiatives and performance goals.
Patton, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	Dual Certified ESE teacher, Support Facilitator, ITF, and MTSS Coordinator working to ensure that students receive supports designed to help them meet learning and SEL goals as outlined in their IEP or 504.
Roache, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics teacher and Department Chair working to assist in data analysis as we set goals for student growth and achievement.
Koporc, Lynn	School Counselor	As a school counselor, she designs and delivers academic and SEL counseling aimed at improving student outcomes. Leading, advocating and collaborating to promote equity and access for all students by connecting the school counseling program to the school's academic mission and school improvement plan.
Crawford, Erin	Instructional Media	Maintains a district approved diverse and current media collection (electronic and print) to facilitate student and staff use of the resources in the media center program.
Brashear, Arlie	Teacher, ESE	Provides Positive Behavior Supports and leadership for students served in our self-contained behavior units, working to help students transition out to the least restrictive environment for additional academic and social learning opportunities. He also serves as an active liaison between our school and the larger community we serve.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

After identifying key stakeholders, including members of the school leadership team, staff, parents, students, and community leaders, their insight and feedback was gathered. This information was analyzed to identify common themes and concerns and integrated into the draft of the SIP. An opportunity to review and vet the plan was provided to further validate and refine the plan, ensuring that it is reflective of the collective vision of our school community and the expectation that all students be taught to high academic standards.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored via weekly classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring of academics, SEL participation, SAC meeting notes, survey results, and a systematic review of discipline data to ensure equitable outcomes. We also monitor faculty PLC participation and feedback and actively solicit staff and community input. A variety of analyzed data results will be shared and reviewed monthly with the school leadership team, SAC, and community stakeholders, with adjustments made as needed and recommended by the team.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	129	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	40	70
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	95	162
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	132	223
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	91	154

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	41	66

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	137	247
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	84	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	35	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	112	164
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	127	210

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	96	150

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days									110	137	247
One or more suspensions									65	84	149
Course failure in ELA									6	9	15
Course failure in Math									7	35	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment									52	112	164
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment									37	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.									83	127	210

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	96	150

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55			59			65		
ELA Learning Gains	47			56			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31			40			47		
Math Achievement*	70			65			67		
Math Learning Gains	64			51			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53			51			43		
Science Achievement*	60			65			73		
Social Studies Achievement*	83			80			84		
Middle School Acceleration	71			71			78		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress				64			45		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	56			
HSP	54			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	55	47	31	70	64	53	60	83	71			
SWD	26	32	27	42	49	37	34	62	50			
ELL	30	40	45	70	75		25	58				
AMI												
ASN	67	63		83	69				100			
BLK	45	44	27	58	64	56	48	88	70			
HSP	44	39	34	67	58	53	48	68	76			
MUL	63	52		66	62	47	52	76	64			
PAC												
WHT	58	48	32	73	65	52	65	86	69			
FRL	46	43	29	61	61	55	52	81	61			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	56	40	65	51	51	65	80	71			64
SWD	35	40	35	43	47	39	39	59	45			
ELL	19	48	53	40	71	73	27					64
AMI												
ASN	85	85		92	77		90		94			
BLK	47	53	47	50	42	36	50	71	62			
HSP	51	55	46	61	52	59	53	78	68			
MUL	71	55		61	44		65	100	73			
PAC												
WHT	61	57	34	68	53	54	69	81	71			
FRL	47	50	41	54	48	49	54	72	54			

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	60	47	67	53	43	73	84	78			45
SWD	32	47	39	35	41	29	43	55	60			
ELL	31	47	50	38	38							45
AMI												
ASN	91	87		87	52		92	100	88			
BLK	54	52	44	54	44	32	51	80	79			
HSP	55	58	50	58	54	57	65	80	76			
MUL	63	63	45	67	53	38	64	89	65			
PAC												
WHT	67	61	45	69	53	43	76	84	78			
FRL	55	56	41	57	49	39	67	78	70			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA Achievement was our lowest performing tested content area at 54% proficiency.
 There is a noticeable decline in ELA scores as students move from 7th to 8th grade.
 Overall proficiency in 7th grade - 58% 8th grade - 51%
 Students with Disabilities (SWD) 7th grade - 31% 8th grade - 19%
 Learning Gains 7th grade - 32% 8th grade - 30%

Contributing factors: Curriculum Complexity and instructional supports, especially for students with disabilities
 Changes in teaching staff?

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

There is a noticeable decline in ELA scores as students move from 7th to 8th grade.
 Overall proficiency in 7th grade - 58% 8th grade - 51%
 Students with Disabilities (SWD) 7th grade - 31% 8th grade - 19%
 Learning Gains 7th grade - 32% 8th grade - 30%

Contributing factors: Curriculum Complexity and instructional supports, especially for students with disabilities
 Changes in teaching staff?

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.

Mathematics in grade 7 proficiency (39%) was below the state average (48%) and represents the greatest gap of our tested subject areas.

Contributing factors:

The math progression allows for all students on grade level to be placed in accelerated courses, resulting in a cohort of students who need extra supports and work on foundational skills so they may master the tested standards.

Multiple changes in teaching staff created challenges for students and disrupted the continuity and coherence of instruction throughout the school year,

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

Overall mathematics achievement increased from 70% to 76%.

Contributing factors:

The math progression allowed for students taking accelerated courses to test at a higher grade level, boosting overall proficiency.

Careful consideration of student readiness to take accelerated options in mathematics combined with highly qualified teachers with expertise in the subject area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Students with disabilities need to receive strong, scaffolded instruction and interventions tailored to their specific needs.

Our students in the lower quartile also will benefit from strong, scaffolded and differentiated instruction and the ability to adhere to class sizes that would provide opportunities for teachers to provide small group individualized attention and support.

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

1. Providing teacher supports via professional development and culture building to create a strong foundation of teaching and learning, building teacher capacity and retaining quality faculty.
2. Culture building for middle school students to foster a feeling of belonging and academic ownership. When students believe in their abilities and feel connected to their school, they are more likely to engage and perform at high levels.
3. Engaging, high quality instruction for SWD/ELA. ELA skills are foundational and translate to success across content areas.
4. Engaging, high quality instruction for LQ 7th and 8th grade students in mathematics. Targeted supports for struggling math students set them up for future success in higher-level math courses and STEM fields.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Focus on Students With Disabilities/ELA proficiency and learning gains, an identified under-performing subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

7th grade: Move from 31% to 36%.

8th grade: Move from 19% to 36%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored via classroom walk-throughs, PLC logs, PM assessment data, and teacher formative assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Systematic, direct-explicit instruction

Focus on SWD/ELA - Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices

2. Implementation of the RACE strategy as a school-wide initiative https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/adlit_pg_082608.pdf#page=22

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

(Referenced in the above researched based, linked article) Teachers should provide adolescents with direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies to improve students' reading comprehension; routines and procedures that readers use to help them make sense of texts. These strategies include, but are not limited to, summarizing, asking and answering questions, paraphrasing, and finding the main idea. Comprehension strategy instruction (RACE) can also include specific teacher activities that have been demonstrated to improve students' comprehension of texts. Direct and explicit teaching involves a teacher modeling and providing explanations of the specific strategies students are learning, giving guided practice and feedback, and promoting independent practice to apply the strategies. An important part of comprehension strategy instruction is the active participation of students in the comprehension process. In addition, explicit instruction involves providing a sufficient amount of support, or scaffolding, to students as they learn the strategies to ensure success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

RACE strategy PD provided during pre-planning, across all content areas.

RACE posters are in every classroom to reinforce a common language around reading and writing and to provide students with a visual reminder and to reinforce the strategy.

Monitoring of the implementation and effectiveness of the strategy to include PM results, teacher feedback, and walk-through evidence.

Follow-up PD at the mid-year to share best practices and data- based evidence of effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@myoneclay.net)

By When: After PM test at Mid-year and in Spring (prior to testing).

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Positive culture and environment relates to both Teacher Retention and Recruitment and Student's self-efficacy.

Measurable Outcome:

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

18% of the teaching staff at LAJH are new to the campus and 12% are new to the teaching profession. The goal is to retain 80% of our new staff for reasons within our control and as a direct result of the school culture and supports provided during the school year. Climate and culture survey results (from both students and staff) will show an increase of 10% satisfaction in the areas of sense of belonging and the importance of school.

Monitoring:

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

Survey results and analysis of satisfaction comparisons from year to year and via feedback collected from our faculty and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Cultivating Collaboration through Strong Professional Learning Communities and New Teacher Talks where we meet informally, in a round table fashion, to chat about their concerns, celebrations, and challenges as first year teachers.

WEB Crew Orientation for 7th graders: Where everyone Belongs is one of our campus themes this year. PBIS - Rewards and Recognitions that support student SEL growth, sense of belonging, and belief in themselves.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cultivating Collaboration - According to several studies, isolation can push teachers to leave the profession altogether. One study mentioned in "Support, Collaborate, Retain" found that when teachers did not have access to collaborative relationships, 1 out of every 5 left the profession (<https://www.recruiting.com/blog/the-best-strategies-for-increasing-teacher-retention-rates/#:NEA>) The level of support that teachers receive can make a huge difference in the way they feel about their jobs. Allowing teachers to have monthly 1-on-1 meetings with administrators and/or the principal is a great way to provide these opportunities for teachers to express their opinions and concerns and hear that they are not alone.

WEB Crew and PBIS Reward and Recognition - Research proves that when PBIS is implemented properly at the secondary level, the PBIS multitiered framework results in improved student outcomes including lower school dropout rates, higher student engagement, decreased behavior problems, improved academic progression, and a sense of belonging.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Weekly PLC

Monthly Teacher Talks for first year teachers

PBIS rewards and recognitions for both staff and students

Tiger Store where students may redeem their Tiger Tokens earned for demonstrating our school character values as outline by ROAR.

Person Responsible: Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly and monthly throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

LAJH has allocated an additional support facilitator to assist with implementing a push-in schedule that complements the dual certified teacher model in support of both students and teachers. All support facilitators are scheduled into classrooms based on the needs of our Students with Disabilities and we have developed new protocols designed to promote higher levels of partnership and information sharing with parents.

The push-in delivery into the general education classroom, in combination with our inclusion settings, allows for the incorporation of services into routine class activities and is delivered in real time. Assistance, additional support, and differentiated instruction is given within the context of ongoing classroom instruction with high expectations for student learning gains and performance outcomes.

Professional development is provided for all teachers and includes a focus on best practices for meeting the needs as outlined in students' IEP, 504, and ELL plans.

Additionally, our PBIS model for rewards and recognitions encourages a growth mindset and is designed to support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral competence of our students, establishing high expectations for all.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Lakeside Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lakeside Elementary School

2752 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://les.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wolfe, Dawn	Principal	The principal's duties include working collaboratively with stakeholders to ensure students are receiving high levels of instruction. Responsibilities also include overseeing the school's leadership team, serving as the instructional leader of the school, and providing professional development to staff based on data and needs. Communicating with stakeholders, maintaining the budget, and other operational functions of the school.
Fowler, Christy	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responsible for tracking and implementing safety drills, Responding to student discipline issues, and other operational functions of the school.
Warner, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responsible for tracking and implementing safety drills, Responding to student discipline issues, and other operational functions of the school.
Calciano, Beth	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team leader and Intervention Team Facilitator
Corless, Bryan	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Team Leader
Davis, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	6th grade Team Leader
Halifko, Lucille	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade Team Leader
Jernigan, Kelly	Instructional Media	Instructional Media Specialist
Lee, Jenny	Teacher, K-12	5th grade Team leader
Thomas, Kristal	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade Team Leader
Childress, Janice	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Ivins, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Kern, Mariah	Teacher, K-12	1st grade Team Leader

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The stakeholders comprised of administration, teachers, parents and the SAC team collaborate to create the School Improvement Plan. End of year data is shared and discussed. The needs and areas for improvement guide the development of the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement plan will be monitored by several school groups throughout the year. The admin team will monitor the goals of the SIP on a quarterly basis using school progress monitoring data. Progress towards these goals will also be monitored through classroom walkthroughs. The school-based leadership team will also be responsible for monitoring progress toward established goals using school assessment data on a quarterly basis. As the plan is being monitored if necessary changes need to take place, the admin team, school-based leadership team, and the SAC team will work collaboratively to make those changes.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	14	14	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	14	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	7	14	14	0	0	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	14	24	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	14	24	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	14	14	20	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64			68			72		
ELA Learning Gains	63			66			75		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			60			58		
Math Achievement*	69			67			77		
Math Learning Gains	73			66			81		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62			63			71		
Science Achievement*	53			52			62		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	23			64			54		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL	24	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	60			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	63	53	69	73	62	53					23
SWD	29	54	55	46	61	54	9					
ELL	21			29								23
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	38	38	54	68	58						
HSP	58	67		59	67	67	44					
MUL	72	68		66	82		83					
PAC												
WHT	69	66	52	76	73	52	52					
FRL	54	48	40	58	67	63	41					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	66	60	67	66	63	52					64
SWD	31	46	48	38	52	52	15					
ELL	70	75		55	67							64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	56	40	44	56	45	20					
HSP	66	63		60	64		47					
MUL	79	50		65	33							
PAC												
WHT	72	68	71	72	70	72	62					
FRL	56	63	58	53	64	58	37					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	72	75	58	77	81	71	62					54
SWD	29	58	45	45	74	70	13					
ELL	46			46	70							54
AMI												
ASN	82	50		82	90							
BLK	57	61	31	60	62	53	31					
HSP	63	74	42	75	86	82	50					
MUL	80	81		93	94							
PAC												
WHT	75	78	69	79	83	73	70					
FRL	64	72	56	74	81	76	58					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The overall achievement level in ELA showed the lowest performance. Learning loss continues to play into the achievement of many students. Issues with attendance also were a factor. We saw that a large percentage of our ELL and SWD students are not making the academic progress that we would expect. Lakeside's ELL population has grown tremendously and plans to provide the appropriate support is still being crafted. We also saw that our high-performing students in prior assessments did not make gains. A new assessment was used this past year so the possibility of students not being fully prepared could be a factor.

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

Overall achievement level in ELA showed the greatest decline from the previous year. There was a 12-point decrease in the area of ELA. Teachers were still learning how to use their resources to instruct students. A new assessment was used this past year. Students and teachers will still need time to adjust to the differences in the assessment. Attendance was also an issue in grades 3rd-6th, therefore academic gaps developed in those students.

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.

Overall achievement level in ELA showed the greatest gap. There was a 12-point decrease in the area of ELA. Teachers were still learning how to use their resources to instruct students. A new assessment was used this past year. Students and teachers will still need time to adjust to the differences in the assessment. Attendance was also an issue in grades 3rd-6th, so academic gaps developed in those students.

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

Ninety-two percent of 6th graders scored in the proficient range. A continued focus on intentional planning and the use of appropriate grade-level resources. As a school, not one overall data component showed improvement. Overall Math proficiency did drop by 9 points. Sixth-grade math scores continue to be high.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our ELL students are not making academic progress. The data also shows that our SWD are not making the necessary gains to be proficient.

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

Increase ELA proficiency overall
 Increase ELA proficiency of ELL students
 Increase ELA proficiency of SWD

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data from last year, the overall achievement in this area was 56%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to increase overall proficiency from 56% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, Lexia Core 5, and classroom performance. Grade level teams will determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration. The school based Literacy Leadership team will also analyze data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. Evidence based supplemental materials are being used with students in small groups along with the SAVVAS Reading series. There will be more of a focus placed on the identification of the specific reading deficiency a student has so that an appropriate and specific intervention can be used to remediate it.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is the standard of instruction that is used by the district. Students that have been taught multiple reading strategies demonstrate greater improvement in reading proficeincy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monitoring of school-wide reading data

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Small group instruction based on regulare progress monitoring, is implemented by reading teachers.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Strong Tier 1 instruction is provided through continuous professional development to maximize whole-group teaching.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data from last year, the overall achievement in this area was 61%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The intended outcome is to increase overall proficiency in the area of math from 61% to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor and analyze data from multiple sources, including Eureka assessments, iReady, and classroom performance. Grade level teams will determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will also be held with the administration. The school based Literacy Leadership team will also analyze data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All students will receive differentiated small group instruction in conjunction with whole group instruction. Evidence based supplemental materials are being used with students in small groups along with the Eureka Math series. If further intervention is required then the use of T2 or T3 evidence based interventions will be used to remediate deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is the standard of instruction that is used by the district. Interventions to evaluate and provide students explicit instruction of foundational, concrete skills will improve their ability to learn grade level content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monitoring of school-wide math data from iReady Math Diagnostics, FAST Math PM, and Eureka Assessments.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Small group instruction in addition to whole group instruction.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Strong T1 instruction through the use of Eureka.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The overall percentage of ELL students who are scoring proficient on the state ELA assessment is below 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall percentage of ELL students who earn a proficient score on the state ELA assessment will be at 50%

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Teachers will monitor data from multiple sources, including SAVVAS assessments, Imagine Learning, and classroom performance. Teachers will use the PLC process to determine trends and analyze data. Data meetings will be held with the administration. Frequent check-ins with the assigned ESOL assistant will also be completed to monitor progress of our ELL students. The ELL committee through the SBLLT will also have an active role in monitoring the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The ELL students have been identified. All students will receive differentiated small-group instruction in conjunction with whole-group instruction. Evidence based supplemental materials will be used with students along with the Reading series. Identified ELL students will also have access to Imagine Learning and the ESOL Assistant.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School wide data and the ELL report were used to determine these strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Reading data from students who receive ELL services will be tracked through classroom performance, progress monitoring data, and Imagine Learning data. Grade level teams and the ELL Committee will be monitoring this data.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

ELL students will use the Imagine Learning program on a daily basis.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the 22-23 school climate survey, 25.9% of 4th-6th graders stated that they felt that their classrooms were managed properly.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The intended goal is to increase this percentage to 40%.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be monitored through the PBIS committee. A newly created committee composed of teacher leaders will also be monitoring students' perceptions of classroom management through a mid-year survey given to 4th through 6th students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Multiple PBIS strategies will be implemented to help address this issue. Consistent expectations create the best environment for academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School data was provided through the Clay County School Climate Survey results.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A School-wide discipline plan will be created and implemented with teacher collaboration

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 2023

Lessons developed in regard to school-wide expectations were developed by teacher leaders and were taught by all teachers during the first 5 days of school

Person Responsible: Dawn Wolfe (dawn.wolfe@myoneclay.net)

By When: August 2024 and continued, consistent use of classroom management strategies throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Clay County Schools

Lakeside Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	16
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	16

Lakeside Junior High School

2750 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ljh.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Lakeside Junior High School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lakeside Junior High School is dedicated to providing a safe physical environment so that each student can obtain the tools necessary to be successful in the twenty-first century. This is accomplished by establishing high positive expectations, mutual self-respect among students and staff, and community involvement to enable students to become confident, self-directed, life-long learners.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
James, Dustin	Principal	Leader of all instructional, operational, and cultural components of Lakeside Junior High. Manages all budgetary items and well as all personnel.
Davis, Hope	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal as a leader of all instructional, operational, and cultural components of Lakeside Junior High. Manages all aspects of academic and behavioral success of students in 8th grade.
Alfano, Megan	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal as a leader of all instructional, operational, and cultural components of Lakeside Junior High. Manages all aspects of academic and behavioral success of students in 7th grade.
Patterson, Lloyd	Dean	Supports the administrative team in all aspects of student behavior.
Clark, Cody	School Counselor	Oversees overall academic and emotional well being of all 7th grade students, including scheduling, assessment planning, and mental health services.
Lanoux, Peyton	School Counselor	Oversees overall academic and emotional well being of all 8th grade students, including scheduling, assessment planning, and mental health services.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We will use the School Advisory Council including teachers, support staff, parents, community members to gain input from all stakeholders.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Upon data collection throughout the year we will discuss data at our monthly leadership meeting. At any time if the SIP needs to be revised we will make those changes to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	101	192
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	37	69
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	79	152
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	45	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	75	136

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	58	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	49	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	77	157
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	35	54	

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days									6	6	12
One or more suspensions									8	11	19
Course failure in ELA									0	0	
Course failure in Math									0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment									39	58	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment									32	49	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.									80	77	157
									0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	35	54	

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70			69			71		
ELA Learning Gains	56			62			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43			49			56		
Math Achievement*	78			75			78		
Math Learning Gains	66			58			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58			58			65		
Science Achievement*	82			71			74		
Social Studies Achievement*	92			86			90		
Middle School Acceleration	73			73			83		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress							40		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	618
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	58			
HSP	64			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	61			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	56	43	78	66	58	82	92	73			
SWD	30	40	36	45	50	43	50	71	52			
ELL	58	45		58	60							
AMI												
ASN	78	53		83	72				100			
BLK	47	51	53	58	66	60	52	86	50			
HSP	66	53	36	70	60	41	74	90	85			
MUL	70	65	57	71	64	40	82	100	50			
PAC												
WHT	73	57	40	83	68	65	87	92	73			
FRL	58	51	43	66	59	56	73	88	59			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	69	62	49	75	58	58	71	86	73			
SWD	28	43	45	38	43	43	28	63	46			
ELL	47	64		60	71							
AMI												
ASN	100	69		82	56		82		86			
BLK	40	42	20	44	36	33	52	65	43			
HSP	65	66	50	62	58	59	58	79	59			
MUL	60	68	50	79	60	80	77	81	83			
PAC												
WHT	73	62	53	81	60	59	75	90	75			
FRL	58	53	41	64	50	54	60	74	60			

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	64	56	78	65	65	74	90	83			40
SWD	34	53	55	42	54	58	32	69	74			
ELL	44	53		29	41		42					40
AMI												
ASN	71	44		81	87				60			
BLK	62	61	46	65	63	63	48	92	70			
HSP	65	68	56	76	61	71	73	90	88			
MUL	71	46	50	78	71	63	75	86	87			
PAC												
WHT	74	67	60	80	65	65	78	91	84			
FRL	62	63	56	70	63	66	60	85	78			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data shows that Students with disabilities in English/Language Arts is our lowest performing area. Trends show that students with disabilities, although have increased in performance over the last several years, are consistently our lowest performing subgroup. Factors of low performance can be attributed to a rise in SWD population.

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

The data shows that ELL students showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Factors of the decline are evident due to the growing number of ELL students enrolled with no english speaking skills at all.

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.

We were higher than the state average in all academic areas. The greatest gap was science which we had 33% greater achievement than the state average.

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

Science showed the greatest achievement from 74% to 82% achievement. Continued supports through PLCs with team level collaboration of data collection and review.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of concern is attendance, with 192 students last year missing 10% or more of the school year.

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

Students with disabilities
 Lowest Quartile
 ELL
 8th grade ELA
 8th grade Math

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities have the lowest performance data for all of our subgroups. This subgroup is significantly lowest that our overall data related to student performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities will raise at least 10% in proficiency in both ELA and Math scores based on PM3 FAST testing compared to the 2022-23 school year raising from 30% to 40% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor through PM1 and PM2 FAST testing data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will collaborate and plan with general education teachers and ESE teachers to work with students with disabilities through a support facilitation model. Professional Development will be provided for ESE and Gen Ed teachers from the Florida Inclusion Network to ensure quality instruction through collaboration of the support facilitation model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The two teacher push in model will allow continual intervention for remediation of skills for struggling students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Ensure master scheduling allows for the support facilitation model, put in collaborative time for teachers to work together such as common planning, and arrange ongoing trainings through the Florida Inclusion Network.

Person Responsible: Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)

By When: By end of the first quarter.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Retaining and recruiting high quality teachers will allow us to continue the work towards high academic achievement for ALL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will retain at least 90% of our teachers for the next school year 2024-2025.

Monitoring:

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

Creating a positive culture and environment for our school will help teachers want to stay at Lakeside Junior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will celebrate successes of faculty and staff monthly creating a positive and appreciative culture through our Outstanding Gators program. We will also have monthly celebrations for all faculty and staff through appreciation events.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Helping our faculty and staff feel appreciated and celebrated for their hard work and efforts will create a positive culture and work environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Set up and create a voting systems where faculty and staff can nominate their peers to celebrate their success and hard work. Email out information monthly and select recipients. Purchase coffee tumblers as a prize for winning and create certificates for presentation. Also create a monthly calendar of faculty/staff appreciation events for the full year with a budget and plan of how to execute the plan.

Person Responsible: Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing monthly.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Mcrae Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mcrae Elementary School

6770 COUNTY ROAD 315 C, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://mre.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

So that all children will know the joy of self-fulfillment, the importance of respect for others, and their responsibility to family, community, and country, McRae Elementary is dedicated to providing an educational atmosphere which will give each child the freedom to dream, the desire to achieve, the courage to act, the knowledge to assist, and the challenge to excel. "Together We Can."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our major goal is to prepare students to become responsible citizens and to be the best they can be. We feel that education is a cooperative effort between school and community.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Winkler, Tamera	Principal	Tammy Winkler is the instructional leader of the school. In her role, she communicates goals and strategies for attaining school goals and provides a support system for improving the knowledge and skill set of every teacher and assistant at the school.
Burt, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Tracy Burt is an instructional leader of the school. In her role, she communicates goals and strategies for attaining school goals and provides a support system for improving the knowledge and skill set of every teacher and assistant at the school.
Brown, Mary	School Counselor	Mary Brown supports academic, behavioral, and social emotional needs of all students. She provides support to help teachers implement strategies to help students be successful learners. Mrs. Brown meets with parents and community members often to provide support and share resources.
Murrhee, Ashley	Math Coach	Ashley Murrhee is the instructional leader for our school. She serves as a liaison between teachers and administration to improve instructional practices and provides resources to help teachers support students to reach proficiency. She provides coaching opportunities to teachers to provide strong instruction and ensure mastery grade level standards.
Scamahorn, Alexandra	Reading Coach	Alex Scamahorn is the instructional leader for our school. She serves as a liaison between teachers and administration to improve instructional practices and provides resources to help teachers support students to reach proficiency. She provides coaching opportunities to teachers to provide strong instruction and ensure mastery grade level standards.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council was involved in the SIP development process as well as business leaders in the community. SAC evaluates our school goals, our parent engagement plan, and our budget. Business leaders are involved in our parent engagement events. SAC and business leaders provide feedback on our school goals and events. They make suggestions on how we can improve these aspects of our school including what we can add to make our school more effective when it comes to meeting the needs of students.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored for effective implementation by analyzing our data on a regular basis. Every quarter, the school leadership team and teachers will evaluate data to determine whether students, particularly students with the greatest achievement gap, are making adequate progress in reading and math. Data used will include FAST progress monitoring, Acadience assessments, and iReady diagnostics. SAC will also monitor the implementation by examining data at meetings. This data will include academic, behavior, and attendance reports.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	12%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	34	22	13	13	10	22	22	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	100	4	13	5	6	0	11	16	0	155
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	13	8	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	15	7	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	9	10	7	0	0	26
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	4	2	2	1	5	13	12	0	0	39

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	22	12	14	23	14	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	1	8	3	5	7	7	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	16	9	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	12	3	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	7	10	8	16	9	0	0	53

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	1	3	9	4	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	22	12	14	23	14	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	1	8	3	5	7	7	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	16	9	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	12	3	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	7	10	8	16	9	0	0	53

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	1	3	9	4	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63			59			64		
ELA Learning Gains	61			55			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49			42			65		
Math Achievement*	69			66			64		
Math Learning Gains	72			71			73		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51			61			63		
Science Achievement*	65			63			67		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	48			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	55			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	61	49	69	72	51	65					
SWD	46	45	35	50	58	48	53					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50			60								
MUL	75			75								
PAC												
WHT	64	60	47	68	72	51	65					
FRL	57	58	41	64	68	48	60					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	55	42	66	71	61	63					
SWD	32	33	29	43	59	45	46					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	25			42								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	57	46	67	73	62	63					
FRL	53	49	37	56	69	47	57					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	65	65	64	73	63	67					
SWD	38	56	63	41	64	61	46					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64	66	64	64	73	62	68					
FRL	58	61	63	53	70	56	64					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 5th grade reading for students with disabilities and 5th grade math for students with disabilities. These students were in 2nd grade in 2020 and missed several months of foundational instruction. In 2022, a 4th grade reading teacher resigned mid-year, resulting in learning gaps for these students. In the fall of 2022, this cohort lost their 5th grade math teacher, also resulting in learning gaps, which negatively impacted our students with disabilities.

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

5th grade math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. In 2022, 76 percent of students were proficient. In 2023, 68 percent of students were proficient. The factor that contributed to this decline was the loss of a 5th grade math teacher in the fall of 2022.

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.

The greatest gap when compared to the state average was 6th grade math. Our school's proficiency was 86% compared to the state average of 54%. The factors that contributed to this gap was quality Tier 1 instruction provided by the math teacher and small group interventions provided by the math coach and ESE teacher.

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

3rd grade math showed the most improvement. In 2022, math proficiency was 51% and in 2023, it was 75% proficient. The math coach supported the 3rd grade math teacher by modeling lessons and participating in 3rd grade PLCs as well as by providing interventions in small group. The math teacher attended additional professional development to improve Tier 1 instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance is the area of greatest concern. In Kindergarten, 34 students had an attendance rate below 90%. The effects of this are reflected in our Kindergarten ELA data. Another area of concern was the overall suspension rate: 65 students were suspended one or more times.

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

Our highest priorities include behavior, attendance, 1st grade ELA and math inclusion classrooms, 4th grade ELA, and 5th grade ELA.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 2023, our ELA proficiency rate was the highest since 2020. In 2019, proficiency was 64%. It dropped to 59% in 2021 and has climbed back since then. Although we have an upward trend, achieving a higher level of proficiency in reading is crucial for future student success. Low achievement in reading impacts academic progress and career goals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, our goal is to increase our ELA proficiency rate to 65 percent on the end-of-year FAST.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor for the desired outcome using FAST progress monitoring data. We will evaluate the data at regular data chats and make adjustments to instruction accordingly. In addition to FAST data, we will monitor student progress using Acadience progress monitoring data and Savvas assessments, including weekly progress checks and unit assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandra Scamahorn (alexandra.scamahorn@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We have multiple evidence-based interventions in place to achieve this goal. For students identified as having a substantial reading deficit, we will provide tier 3 interventions using Corrective Reading and tier 2 interventions using Spelling Through Morphographs. Using the Science of Reading and LETRS best practices, we will provide small group instruction for students below benchmark based on their area(s) of need (as determined by Acadience and FAST): phonemic awareness (Heggerty's Bridge the Gap), advanced phonics (LETRS scope and sequence and instructional routines), fluency (Savvas cold reads), vocabulary (Spelling Through Morphographs and Savvas), and comprehension (Savvas). Students will also work on deficits and practice reading skills using Lexia Core5 and Lexia PowerUp.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on student need allows us to provide targeted instruction that fills instructional gaps and that provides additional support for students with disabilities. Using progress monitoring tools, we can make immediate adjustments to our instruction in response to student learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 professional development for teachers and Title I assistants, who will provide data-based targeted instruction to fill gaps. This includes developing common assessments, gathering and analyzing data, responding to the data by planning specific interventions using evidence-based strategies, assessing whether these strategies were effective, and adjusting instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Scamahorn (alexandra.scamahorn@myoneclay.net)

By When: Year-long

Title I assistants, ESE teachers, coaches, and classroom teachers will use district-approved materials to deliver instruction as well as manipulatives and other learning materials to foster multi-sensory learning. Instructors will evaluate assessments, data, and instructional strategies in PLC on a weekly basis in order to adjust instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Scamahorn (alexandra.scamahorn@myoneclay.net)

By When: Year-long

Three times a year, we will administer benchmark assessments using Acadience and the PAST (as stipulated in the CERP). This data, in addition to the FAST data, will be used to identify students at risk and instructional needs, and will guide small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Scamahorn (alexandra.scamahorn@myoneclay.net)

By When: Multiple times a year

The classroom teacher, ESE teacher, reading coach, and assistants will administer assessments based on the standards being taught. Students in Tier II instructional groups will be assessed at least once a month and students in Tier III will be assessed at least twice a month. At PLC, instructors will evaluate assessment results to determine the effectiveness of the intervention, adjust instruction, and determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Scamahorn (alexandra.scamahorn@myoneclay.net)

By When: Multiple times a year

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2019 school year our overall proficiency for McRae was 64% and we have raised it up to 75% this past school year. Our intentional instruction, small groups and SDI have help students achieve proficiency. This is our highest Math proficiency since 2019.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST data, we have an opportunity for growth in Math.

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency in Number Sense & Operations from 75.00% to 76.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, iReady in grades K-5, and ALEKS in grade 6 to monitor progress throughout the year. This data is collected and analyzed by our school based Math Coach and shared and discussed with teachers on a regular basis at quarterly data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on data, including FAST progress monitoring, iReady, ALEKS, and classroom assessments. Classroom teachers and ESE teachers will create intentional small groups that target specific skills. Title I assistants will also push into classrooms to provide instruction on foundational skills and to reinforce grade-level skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on student need allows us to provide targeted instruction that fills instructional gaps and that provides additional support for students with disabilities. Using progress monitoring tools, we can make immediate adjustments to our instruction in response to student learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Instructors will determine the effectiveness of instruction based on data and adjust instruction as needed. Students will set goals based on their data, track their data, and have opportunities to celebrate success.

Small group instruction will also be provided on an immediate and fluid basis dependent on student need and feedback will be immediate.

At PLC, instructors will analyze baseline data to form small groups based on need. Small group instruction will be monitored on a regular basis. For Tier II instruction, students will be assessed at least once a month, and for Tier III instruction, students will be assessed at least twice a month. Data will be collected and shared at PLC to analyze and determine how students are responding to instruction. Instruction will be adjusted in response to data.

Progress monitoring will be brief and reflect the type of instruction provided. Instructors will also embed checks for understanding throughout their lessons, both whole group and small group, and adjust instruction as needed.

Students will track their own data and set goals.

Every lesson, teachers will model how to solve math problems in whole group and small group settings.

Teachers will use think alouds with "I statements" to model their thinking,

Teachers will show the step-by-step process for solving problems, address misconceptions, and model multiple methods for solving problems.

Teachers will establish success criteria by posting a completed problem with its steps illustrated in a visual representation posted in the classroom.

During guided and independent practice, the teacher will first refer students to the visual representation before providing assistance or feedback.

Students will be taught to check their work against the visual representations and will have opportunities to create their own for both the classroom and in the form of their own reference materials.

Students will be provided with ample opportunities to practice standards-based math problems in both collaborative and individual settings.

Teachers will provide immediate feedback and then give students the opportunity to correct their mistakes and rework problems.

Person Responsible: Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the year to be met at the end of 2023-2024 school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus for positive culture and environment is to improve class management as reported by students on the CCDS Climate survey from 57 percent to 60 percent. This was a decrease from 62 percent in fall of 2021. Lack of strong class management negatively impacts student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase students' rating of class management from 57 percent to 60 percent by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus by evaluating the following data: number of referrals, days in ISS, days in OSS, and number of incidents for all grade levels. We will monitor the number of students reward in our Horse Power PBIS incentive program as well. We will also conduct brief surveys throughout the year to attain student feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our school will follow PBIS interventions using the three tiers. For tier 1, the faculty and staff will explicitly teach classroom and school-wide procedures and expectations. The principal reinforces our three expectations daily: Be Safe, Be Kind, and Be An Active Learner. The PBIS team has developed our Horse Power plan that breaks down our three expectations into specific actions that students can take to be well-rounded scholars at our school. These expectations are taught and retaught throughout the year and students are rewarded for making positive choices. During pre-planning, Kristi Gomez provided a professional development session on preventing undesired student behaviors. Each grade level developed targets and success criteria for behavior and aligned these with our three expectations. Mrs. Winkler will offer a book study for teachers using the book Flooded in order to continue professional development in this area.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is an evidence-based strategy based on the three tiers of support. We will implement our PBIS plan school-wide to provide students with instruction on positive behaviors and being proactive, anticipating problem behaviors before they occur.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Faculty and staff will teach classroom and school-wide expectations. We will model what this looks like in different situations. Classes will discuss our 3 expectations - Be Safe, Be Kind, Be an Active Learner. Students will share examples and non examples.

Person Responsible: Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Faculty and staff will reward positive behavior, including Horse Power phone calls home. They will also provide tier 2 and tier 3 support for students who are not demonstrating positive behavior. Reminders will be provided when necessary. Problem areas will be retaught immediately.

Person Responsible: Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Year-long

Administrators will conduct walk-throughs, logs-tracking and giving teachers and staff specific feedback on how the specific praise/feedback they are providing to students.

Person Responsible: Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Year-long

Teachers will participate in a book study on the book Flooded and meet regularly to discuss strategies. Teachers will also bring behavior data to PLCs to set goals and problem-solve.

Person Responsible: Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Year-long

Clay County Schools

Middleburg Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Middleburg Elementary School

3958 MAIN ST, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://mbe.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with ALL to provide an educational experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for ALL. Our teachers will increase student achievement for ALL in a working and learning environment built upon respect, responsibility and safety.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Middleburg Elementary School exists to prepare lifelong learners for personal success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills necessary for connections in an ever-changing world.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilkerson, Becky	Principal	The principal is responsible for ensuring certified, in field teachers are in place in all classrooms. The principal is responsible for ensuring safety, securing and academic progress for the students, teachers and staff. The principal is responsible for record keeping, finances, professional development, and maintaining a positive learning and work environment.
Lawson, Jackie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for the school in the principal's absence. The Assistant principal is responsible for property, textbook inventory, safety drills and assists the principal with professional development and all other principal responsibilities.
Haug, Ashleigh	Instructional Coach	Assists with the development of the Title I plan, SIP plan, SAC and the implementation of these plans as well as assisting with professional development, data tracking and supporting teachers with classroom management, lesson planning, lesson modeling and any other areas teachers need support with. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Sandin, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	Assists with the development of the Title I plan, SIP plan, SAC and the implementation of these plans as well as assisting with professional development, data tracking and supporting teachers with classroom management, lesson planning, lesson modeling and any other areas teachers need support with. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Brown, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Team leader and 4th grade teacher. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Durso, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Team leader and 6th grade teacher. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gay, Stacey	Instructional Media	Team leader and Media Specialist. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Martin, Victoria	Teacher, ESE	Team leader and ESE Teacher. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Morris, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	Team leader and 1st grade teacher. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Stewart, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Team leader and kindergarten teacher. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Bicknell, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Team leader and second grade teacher. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.
Artzer, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Team leader and third grade teacher. Mentor teacher for new teachers on her team, collaboration between administration and her team, planning and implementing grade level field trips, activities and other leadership roles as delegated by administration. Participates in Curriculum Council review of instructional materials to ensure they meet the standards, rigor of the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
standards and the appropriateness of the material for meeting the standards and grade level.		

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

All stakeholders, including our school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, students, businesses, and community leaders are invited to attend regularly scheduled School Advisory Council Meetings to provide input on our School Improvement Plan. All of our families are invited to attend Title I events throughout the school year where feedback and input on the Title I program and activities are collected. Families are also periodically surveyed through our social media, website, and email. Through these mediums, stakeholders evaluate the data to form our school improvement plan and provide input on prioritization of needs through data analysis, and selecting interventions to meet those needs.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Ongoing data analysis will occur throughout the year for each teacher/class and during whole group professional learning communities. During the creation of the school improvement plan, check points were determined to check the progress of each goal and measure the impact of learning in meeting the State’s academic standards. These check points include progress monitoring assessments through the State as well as classroom and district assessments that will determine growth and/or mastery of the standard. Our school leadership team will continue to monitor progress through classroom walkthroughs, common planning and professional learning community minutes, and staff feedback. If adequate progress is not being made then the modifications to the implemented strategies and interventions will need to be modified to ensure continuous improvement. The data will be monitored and shared with the leadership team monthly to make continuous adjustments.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	18%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No

2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	11	12	19	9	18	8	25	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	4	4	6	12	0	0	31
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	17	8	12	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	8	12	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	19	17	8	12	0	0	56

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	10	2	3	6	8	11	0	0	42

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	17	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	27	19	19	20	14	21	34	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	3	4	6	8	5	10	11	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	15	9	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	7	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	8	10	23	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	10	13	15	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	16	8	10	23	0	0	57

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	27	19	19	20	14	21	34	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	3	4	6	8	5	10	11	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	15	9	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	7	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	8	10	23	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	10	13	15	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	16	8	10	23	0	0	57

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61			63			63		
ELA Learning Gains	65			57			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47			47			59		
Math Achievement*	70			66			69		
Math Learning Gains	72			55			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60			38			61		
Science Achievement*	69			49			67		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	65			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	65	47	70	72	60	69					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
SWD	37	44	30	47	65	54	29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	62		65	85							
MUL	40			80								
PAC												
WHT	63	66	44	70	70	57	75					
FRL	55	65	42	66	65	51	64					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	57	47	66	55	38	49					
SWD	29	37	43	34	31	35	14					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47			53								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64	57	47	67	57	44	52					
FRL	59	50	50	63	45	36	55					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	66	59	69	72	61	67					
SWD	24	42	41	32	54	55	25					
ELL												
AMI												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	50		73	82							
MUL	80											
PAC												
WHT	63	65	58	69	71	58	64					
FRL	55	63	59	58	70	63	58					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is ELA achievement which has decreased 2% over the last three years and the bottom quartile students which decreased from 59% to 47% over the last three years.

Attendance and students not being able to regulate their emotions are two factors impacting our students' academic performance. Some other factors related to this decline are the inconsistent implementation of small group - differentiated instruction specifically in our ESE population.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2022 is the achievement in ELA lowest 25th percentile which is 47%. This is consistent with the previous year at 47% but overall is a 12% decrease from 2019.

Attendance and students not being able to regulate their emotions are two factors impacting our students' academic performance. Some other factors related to this decline are the inconsistent implementation of small group- differentiated instruction specifically in our ESE population.

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.

Our greatest gap was in Math compared to the State average. Our math proficiency for last year was 70% while the State's average was 53%.

Changing schedules to allow teachers to focus on one subject, our ESE teachers modifying their schedules to provide support and targeting small group interventions earlier in the school year contributed to our math achievement. All teachers focused on communicating the learning targets and success criteria.

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

The data component with the most improvement was in Math and Science. The achievement of the lowest 25% percentile in Math achievement which increased by 22% and math learning gains which increased by 17%. Science achievement also increased by 20%.

Our 5th and 6th grade teams changed their schedules to implement a departmentalized model allowing one teacher to focus on one subject. Targeting small group interventions in the beginning of the year. Our ESE team also adjusted their schedules to all use a push in model for interventions. The staff, as a whole, focused on increasing their capacity to effectively communicate learning targets and success criteria.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our primary concern is attendance. 102 of our students attended 90% or less of school.

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

1. Overall ELA Achievement from 59% to 62%.
2. Increase Math Proficiency from 70% to 73%.
3. Increase the percentage of students who feel their peers treat them with kindness from 54 to 57%
4. Increase ELA proficiency of our students with disabilities from 45% to 47%

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities are underperforming their general education peers on statewide assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FAST performance data. Our current average proficiency for students with disabilities is 45% with a total population of average of 59%, leaving a 14% achievement gap. Our goal is a 2% increase in ELA SWD proficiency, to increase to 47% to close the gap for our students.

Monitoring:

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

Florida Assessment of Student Thinking progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Lawson (jacquelyn.lawson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

High-leverage practices, professional development on inclusive practices, quarterly collaboratives between general education and ESE teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Large discrepancy gaps between overall proficiency and ESE subgroup proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional development behind implementing high leverage and inclusive teaching practices focusing on differentiation and specially designed instruction, meeting the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Jackie Lawson (jacquelyn.lawson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Quarterly collaboratives between general education and ESE teachers to discuss student data and plan for targeted instruction.

Person Responsible: Jackie Lawson (jacquelyn.lawson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA proficiency has decreased the last few years and reading is integrated into all other content areas. For this reason we are working towards increasing our students' proficiency and becoming stronger readers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase our ELA proficiency from 59 to 62%

Monitoring:

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

Florida Assessment of Student Thinking progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Lawson (jacquelyn.lawson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction in K-3 and with students with identified gaps in grades 4-6 through the Multi Tiered Supports System, Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading as adopted by the district, Small group instruction will be implemented in all ELA classrooms as a fixed portion of their daily ELA block, and Progress Monitoring will be supported and analyzed frequently in all grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Science of Reading research shows students must have a solid foundation in phonological and phonemic awareness in order to manipulate phonemes to read. Explicit and systematic instruction in these areas and others in the Science of Reading ensures all students receive this instruction. Small group instruction allows teachers to provide students with specific skill gaps intensive and focused intervention to close the gaps before they widen. Progress Monitoring allows us to see mastery as students close gaps and highlight what areas students still lack mastery in. Based on this data, we can formulate appropriate next steps for each student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All teachers will implement evidence based reading strategies (activate prior knowledge, question generation, monitoring comprehension, identifying the main idea, paraphrasing and summarizing) as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs and student work analysis in PLCs.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will implement Lexia in grades K-2 and as needed for students in grades 3-6

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

All teachers will develop small groups based on individual student needs to fill gaps or excel students that are on or above grade level. Classroom assistants will help teacher and support students by pulling additional small groups to fill gaps for students that are below grade level. As well as Teacher Salaries that are paid out of Title 1 funds.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

All teachers will implement total participation techniques and highly engaging practices as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work as learned in our Teach Like a Pirate Book Study. By thoroughly engaging our learners in ELA instruction, student achievement will increase

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Provide a parent after hours event to teach parents how to implement evidence based reading strategies at home and build an at home library for students.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

All teachers will keep progress monitoring data notebooks and use this data to guide their whole group instruction and develop small groups As a team we will review this data once every quarter for each grade level. Subs will need to be provided for teachers to attend the data meeting and to update and share the progress of their students. Teachers will need supplies in order to update their data binders at these meetings.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Third grade teachers will provide support to incoming third graders through reading comprehension instruction during the summer. This will ease the transition from second to third grade.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: July 2024

Progress Monitoring: All teachers will engage in quarterly data chats to evaluate progress monitoring and create plans to supplement and extend learning. Teachers will track their student's formative and summative assessment data to inform their instruction.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our overall math proficiency has reached a plateau with an opportunity for continued improvement. Overall proficiency on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking is 70%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase overall math proficiency on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking from 70 to 73%

Monitoring:

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

Florida Assessment of Student Thinking

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small group instruction will be implemented in all Math classrooms and Progress Monitoring will be supported and analyzed frequently in all grade levels. Use of visual representations will be a featured strategy in all Math classrooms to assist students with developing a concrete understanding of mathematical processes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction allows teachers to provide students with specific skill gaps intensive and focused intervention to close the gaps before they widen. Progress Monitoring allows us to see mastery as students close gaps and highlight what areas students still lack mastery in. Based on this data, we can formulate

appropriate next steps for each student. Visual Representations in the Math classroom allow students to better understand the relationship between math representations and their abstract symbols.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will provide targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the whole group instruction. Classroom Assistants will pull additional small groups to support students in their learning gaps. Teacher salaries that are paid out of Title 1 will also support students by pulling small groups to meet students in their specific learning gaps, or to excel students in their learning.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will continually monitor a child's progress to match lessons to the individuals knowledge level.

Person Responsible: Kathy Wray (kewray@oneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

All teachers will implement total participation techniques and highly engaging practices as evidenced in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work as learned in our Teach Like a Pirate Book Study. By thoroughly engaging our learners in ELA instruction, student achievement will increase

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

All 2-5th grade math teachers will implement Reflex Math to increase addition, subtraction, multiplication and division fact fluency. We will provide students headphones to immerse them in the learning.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Each year, faculty and students are asked to complete a Culture and Climate Survey. The 2022-2023 survey results indicated our lowest scoring area shows only 54% of students in grades 3-6 believe that their peers treat them with kindness.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to increase the amount of students who feel as if their peers treat them with kindness from 54% to 57%

Monitoring:

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

Climate and culture survey, student discipline data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will help families with their parenting skills by providing information on children's developmental stages so they can better understand and support their students at home. Teachers will also Engage Families in Constructing Goals-Monitoring Progress-Supporting Learning Together. We will invest in systems, like 7 Mindsets, to support high fidelity implementation across time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parenting: Help families with their parenting skills by providing information on children's developmental stages

Teachers Engage Families in Constructing Goals-Monitoring Progress Supporting Learning Together Investing in evidence based programs school-wide, such as 7 Mindsets, will support educators' professional and personal wellness while simultaneously giving the tools they need to develop more positive relationships with students and coworkers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 a parent after hours event for families to teach strategies about building positive peer interactions, resolving conflict, and regulating emotions.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Teachers and students will engage in our Pirates Gold PBIS system. Teachers will provide specific feedback when students earn their coins and students will record the reason they earned the coin.

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will create "calm down corners" in their classrooms for students to utilize to help them regulate their emotions and encourage conflict resolution

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Teachers and guidance counselor will complete 7 mindsets lessons every day to teach students age specific character

Person Responsible: Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Clay County Schools

Middleburg High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Middleburg High School

3750 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://mhs.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a safe, educational environment that fosters students’ intellectual, social, emotional and physical potential, empowering them to become productive, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision Statement

Middleburg High School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

Middleburg High School Beliefs:

- *Students will develop the skills necessary to think independently and become effective problem solvers.
- *Students will develop an appreciation and understanding of the value of lifelong learning through enrichment courses and activities.
- *Teachers will encourage students to learn valuable lessons through athletics, performing arts and other extracurricular activities.
- *Teachers will engage the intellectual curiosity and creativity of students, allowing them to become multifaceted learners.
- *Students will learn to accept and adapt to change and will recognize the value of work.
- *Teachers will encourage students to create ethical relationships with other students, faculty members and all members of the community.
- *Students will develop a positive sense of leadership, personal responsibility, and good citizenship.
- *Students will develop awareness of career opportunities and the skills and education required for entrance into various occupational fields.
- *Teachers will encourage a sense of community within the school and provide an atmosphere that encourages parental participation.
- *All members of the school community will strive to create an environment of toleration of diverse opinions and beliefs.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Aftuck, Martin	Principal	Support SIP team when needed.
Knox, Miranda	Assistant Principal	Lead SIP team with Teacher Lead. Collect data to bring to meeting. Track goals.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders are involved in meetings and invited to participate in events. Business stakeholders help provide funds for onboarding freshmen events throughout the year. Parents provide feedback and support when needed at meetings and help organize volunteers at events throughout the year. Teachers help collect data and analyze the data to track goals and see new needs throughout the school year at meetings. Students give feedback through surveys and help volunteer at events throughout the year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Attendance will be tracked weekly. As data comes in the SAC team will work with the PBIS (Mindset Motivators) team to appropriately reward students and encourage attendance. Students that are not attending will be tracked and referred to the success team to be addressed and come up with a plan to work with the student on improving attendance.

Discipline will be tracked bi-weekly. As data comes in the SAC team will work with the PBIS (Mindset Motivators) team to establish how to address areas of opportunity.

English Scores will be tracked through county testing 3 times throughout the year with a final state test. Student data will be tracked by teachers and support facilitators to indicate student areas of opportunity. As student data comes in teachers will adjust and readdress materials that need improvement. The head of the Literacy Council will be responsible for tracking the data and relaying that information to the faculty.

All of these efforts together will help close achievement gaps and increase the achievements of students in meeting the State's academic standards.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	23%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	589

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	54			52			57		
ELA Learning Gains	47			48			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33			34			34		
Math Achievement*	43			42			59		
Math Learning Gains	46			37			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33			29			48		
Science Achievement*	74			72			67		
Social Studies Achievement*	82			82			80		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	92			93			88		
College and Career Acceleration	78			61			68		
ELP Progress							60		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	582
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	47			
HSP	58			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	47	33	43	46	33	74	82		92	78	
SWD	20	26	26	18	37	38	39	63		76	74	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	70	70										
BLK	33	31	20	20	41	46	54	67		93	62	
HSP	47	47	29	33	43	41	76	88		97	74	
MUL	54	40		79	71		88			85	82	
PAC												
WHT	56	48	35	45	46	29	74	82		92	79	
FRL	43	39	26	36	40	31	61	77		90	75	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	48	34	42	37	29	72	82		93	61	
SWD	24	37	31	20	33	30	47	55		89	32	
ELL	27	36										
AMI												
ASN	82											
BLK	45	62	50	21	30	33	60	69		100	40	
HSP	53	47	38	41	44	31	76	81		84	48	
MUL	59	65		44	31			73		100	62	
PAC												
WHT	52	46	31	42	36	29	72	83		94	64	
FRL	48	44	32	40	35	29	69	73		91	54	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	57	50	34	59	50	48	67	80		88	68	60
SWD	21	32	25	29	40	30	44	53		79	61	
ELL												60
AMI												
ASN												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	42	42	18	41	56		45	63		73		
HSP	55	45	50	59	41	31	71	79		94	52	
MUL	68	62		58	68		79	80		100	45	
PAC												
WHT	58	51	34	60	50	47	67	81		88	71	
FRL	49	44	32	53	51	51	62	74		83	63	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 performance was in ELA Achievement and ELA Lowest 25th percentile. We are experiencing a higher number of students that are in need of intensive reading.

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

ELA Achievement and ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline. Due to our students needing more assistance in reading and comprehension through Intensive Reading classes, we are seeing an decrease in scores. These are lagging factors that are effects of covid.

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.

ELA Achievement and ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed the largest gap. Due to our students needing more assistance in reading and comprehension through Intensive Reading classes, we are seeing an decrease in scores. These are lagging factors that are effects of covid.

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

The greatest areas of improvement were math achievement. We have split the algebra classes into a full year of Algebra 1A and a second year of Algebra 1B. The students will test in their second year. We will see how this affects our scores this year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance

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

Attendance

ELA Achievement

ELA Learning Gains

Algebra scores this year

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our ELA SWD is currently 21% proficient which is currently the lowest in the county.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of ELA SWD will increase learning gains from 21% to 26%, a 5% gain.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will discuss progress of students through productive PLCs. Teachers will be aware of and track their lower 33% within their classes to use data to accurately group and target student areas of weakness. Administrators will partner with teachers to brainstorm on key players to ensure student growth. Support facilitators will push-in to targeted classrooms to support SWD in real time. Teachers and Support Facilitators will plan together. Teachers and Support Facilitators will monitor student trackers and discuss weekly within PLCs on how they will incorporate the technology pieces into class activities.

A Literacy Council has been created. The head of the Literacy Council is in charge of tracking the data and documenting areas of weakness. This information will be shared out to the faculty in order to plan accordingly.

Monthly PLCs will also be literacy based done through Literacy Council.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Curry (deborah.curry@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Support Facilitators will push-in to classrooms to support ESE teachers. Schedule will be made and followed to allow the maximum amount of time in the classroom.
2. ELA department will implement and utilize a spreadsheet that tracks the lower quartile, and the bottom 33%. This tracker includes key players involved in specific student's day, including all subject area teachers. Teachers will meet in groups to discuss strategies to assist specific students that they have in common. Reading and writing strategies will be implemented throughout all subject areas.
3. Technology access for teachers and students will benefit the Lower Quartile students. Teachers will use Lexia, FAST Data, and track lexile scores through the year. Individual data tracking on the student's behalf will create ownership of their own learning.
4. Literacy Council will have monthly PDs focused on improving school literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Pushing in will allow for more support in real time with students that have more needs. Planning together will allow for the most efficient lessons to capitalize on the teacher and support facilitators skills. The Tracker will assist all subject area teachers to track specific students in the lower 33%, work in groups to brainstorm ideas that will assist individual student needs, and improve overall ELA scores. Evidence of this

strategy's success should be seen through lexile score increases on Achieve 3000, Lexia, and FAST scores.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. ELA Dept will identify the lower 33% of students in their classes.
2. Teachers and Support Facilitators will use a data tracker to identify students and track their progress.
3. Teachers and Support Facilitators will target specific standards that students are struggling with to help them achieve mastery.
4. Teachers and Support Facilitators will discuss strategies that are working and continue to work through issues students are having.
5. Teachers and Support Facilitators will continue to remediate throughout the year based off of information that is being tracked in the tracker.
6. Students that are not attending or are really struggling will meet with the Student Success Team as needed through a teacher referral to the Student Success Team.

Person Responsible: Deborah Curry (deborah.curry@myoneclay.net)

By When: Last (3rd) FAST

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student attendance has improved to 90%, but we want to continue to make this a priority. Also, although referrals have decreased, we are ranked high in relation to the state for higher level referrals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Level 3 & 4 referrals will decrease 5% from previous years by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The Discipline Team will monitor discipline date through Synergy and the reports sent out each month by Climate and Culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miranda Knox (miranda.knox@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive Behavior Incentive Systems help create a sense of belonging and appreciation for positive behaviors. PBIS is a school wide system that rewards students for positive behaviors and actions throughout the school year. It rewards students for going above and beyond. PBIS also keeps track of issues that occur around the building throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS programs have shown an increase in attendance by specifically rewarding students for positive behaviors throughout the school year. It has also statistically helped schools decrease referrals throughout the school year when implemented consistently.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Plan incentives for every Week.

Person Responsible: Miranda Knox (miranda.knox@myoneclay.net)

By When: Before the beginning of every month.

Explain to the staff how we will reward students, why we are rewarding students, and how we will implement the program throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Miranda Knox (miranda.knox@myoneclay.net)

By When: Preplanning 8/8/2023

Have staff track who they give the Bravo Broncos rewards in BB Tracker throughout each round and draw a student name for an athletic pass or other reward to be determined.

Person Responsible: Miranda Knox (miranda.knox@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Track discipline and attendance data each month.

Person Responsible: Miranda Knox (miranda.knox@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We know that we cannot teach students who are not at school. We need attendance to increase so that students can achieve at a higher level, close achievement gaps, and help more students graduate. Last year our average daily attendance was 82%. This has to improve to reach our students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for our students average daily attendance is above 92% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This year the attendance team will be focusing on data and targeting students with low attendance by making phone calls and sending emails to absentees, and helping navigate through attendance meetings. We believe that this will help us alleviate chronic absenteeism. We will also create success plans for all students that participate in an attendance meeting. We will use attendance reports to identify students that show EWS and target these students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Williams (justin.williams@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A Student Success Team (SST) is a positive, team oriented approach to assisting students with a wide range of concerns related to their school performance, attendance, and experience. The purpose of the SST is to identify and intervene based off of early warning signs, in order to design a support system for students having difficulty in the general education classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are choosing Student Success Team meetings to address attendance at MHS because this will help us build relationships with students, parents, and community partners to assist our students that need a little more structure or help developing a plan.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Attendance Team will pull attendance records each week to identify students that are at an attendance percentage of less than 90%.

Person Responsible: Justin Williams (justin.williams@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Attendance Team set up a Success Team meeting. These meetings will occur as needed. If a student's GPA is below or very close to a 2.0 and they are in the early warning signs with attendance we will schedule a Student Success Team meeting with parents and student.

Person Responsible: Justin Williams (justin.williams@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Attendance Team will address concerns and develop a plan with the student and parent/guardian.

Person Responsible: Justin Williams (justin.williams@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Attendance Team will follow up with families to keep them on track and assist with any other needs possible.

Person Responsible: Justin Williams (justin.williams@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Clay County Schools

Montclair Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Montclair Elementary School

2398 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://mce.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

(*Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP can be made available in most languages.)

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, William	Principal	
Harrison , Kristen	Assistant Principal	
Pugh, Melissa	Teacher, Adult	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SAC meets each quarter to review the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, budget from Title I, goals for the SIP/CNA and Parent and Family engagement plan. All required stakeholders vote on these items however the meeting is open to anyone who would like to attend. SAC meetings as well as the Annual Title I meeting is used to involve parents and get input from them as well as businesses and community leaders. Teachers are involved in SAC for decision making as well as faculty meetings so they are giving input and helping to development the plan. Input is used from the previous years SAC meeting to help inform and create the plan for this year as well.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We will look at the FAST data during grade level meetings each month to ensure students are in small groups and receiving instruction to fill their gaps according to the counties Decision Tree. Students who are not meeting the state benchmarks will be placed in groups and monitored using SRA Decoding, SIPPS, SRA Comprehension and other approved materials mastery test. The CNA will be used to monitor gains each time testing occurs for FAST to ensure the school is on track to meet our goals listed in the Title I plan.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	9	12	6	2	4	5	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	1	5	9	0	0	19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	2	6	12	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	10	12	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	12	24	15	18	19	0	0	92

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	2	1	2	6	13	0	0	26

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	11	14	12	12	11	10	13	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	8	3	0	3	5	10	8	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	18	14	17	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	2	5	9	11	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	11	14	12	12	11	10	13	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	8	3	0	3	5	10	8	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	18	14	17	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	2	5	9	11	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	59			57			46		
ELA Learning Gains	61			61			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46			47			40		
Math Achievement*	60			53			51		
Math Learning Gains	62			56			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47			52			37		
Science Achievement*	69			57			44		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	44			55			44		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	3	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	61	46	60	62	47	69					44
SWD	31	47	46	32	49	29	40					
ELL	42	43	30	42	45	40						44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	48	27	43	45	18						
HSP	51	55	42	54	62	56						43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64	65	55	67	70	59	80					
FRL	45	48	42	48	57	43	52					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	57	61	47	53	56	52	57					55
SWD	26	40	25	24	37	36						
ELL	29	64		42	91							55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	50		31	50		50					
HSP	51	57		49	61		60					58
MUL	61	71		56	57							
PAC												
WHT	65	66	33	60	56	38	60					
FRL	39	53	47	38	45	59	48					50

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	54	40	51	51	37	44					44
SWD	16	38	38	24	45	39	17					
ELL	23	44	50	45	50	50						44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	39	36	39	50	36	18					
HSP	32	51	55	40	49	50	44					33
MUL	60	68		48	53							
PAC												
WHT	55	56	35	57	51	25	48					
FRL	34	45	42	45	56	40	36					56

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Students in the subgroup black students had the lowest performance. Factors that contribute to this data is lack of parent involvement according to teacher communication logs. Teachers struggled to get in contact with parents via a working phone line or to get parents to come in for conferencing. Attendance was also a contributing factor for this subgroup. Many of the parents do not have transportation and if their student misses the bus they have no way to get them to school.

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

None of our subgroups exhibit a decline. They all showed an increase or stayed the same.

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.

Our 5th grade data was below the state average data in both ELA and Math. This grade level group had a high number of ESE scholars both in the general education population and in our self-contained units and an increase in ELL numbers.

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

ELL students showed the greatest improvement. Our Title I team started targeting these students by testing them in reading to find out where their gaps were. Then we targeted their instruction in either decoding or comprehension using SRA decoding or comprehension programs in small groups 4 times a week.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Black students and students with disabilities

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

Black, students with disabilities, and ELL

ELL students are doing Imagine Learning, working with our 2 ESOL assistants for enhanced small groups, and doing small group interventions with state and county approved programs to ensure their growth. Title 1 teachers are working with the county ESOL specialist to ensure student gains are being monitored and changes are made as needed to accommodate these students. Title 1 is tracking ESOL students as well as black and swd progress to ensure they are making gains and if not looking at changes to their interventions in small group.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on Synergy data, our area of focus will be positive culture and environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Student Engagement and decrease referrals from 105 to 95 by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

7 Mind Sets will be used in all classrooms to deliver SEL instruction.

Kagan Strategies Flipbooks will be used for teaching activities in all classrooms.

Communication Folders for students will be taken home every Tuesday for better school/home communications.

Parent Night to help parents get the app for PBIS and ParentVue for positive behavior communications/strategies for parents to use for calming behaviors

PBIS Rewards used for accountability and positive student behaviors

Monitoring:

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

Each grade level will meet monthly with administration to look at the referral data and how the goal is being work towards

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

7 Mind Sets will be used in all classrooms to deliver SEL instruction.

Kagan Strategies Flipbooks will be used for teaching activities in all classrooms.

Communication Folders for students will be taken home every Tuesday for better school/home communications.

Parent Night to help parents get the app for PBIS and ParentVue for positive behavior communications/strategies for parents to use for calming behaviors

PBIS Rewards used for accountability and positive student behaviors

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS Supporting and Responding to Students' Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Needs document.

Each school will identify the Tier 1 universal prevention strategies and Tier 2 secondary prevention strategies for the specific topic they identify as their focus for the year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Reading.

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our Reading Proficiency from 58.00% to 65.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

65% of students will score proficient on FAST in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Data Monitoring Source: Grade Specific Focus Supporting Larger Goal

FAST K Letters and Sounds

1 Phonics

2 Phonics

3 Comprehension

4 Comprehension

5 Comprehension

6 Comprehension

These will be measured each time the FAST is taken.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will receive instruction weekly on Core5 and PowerUp and headphones/earbuds will be provided to ensure this is done in the best setting possible

Primary teachers will use Heggerty and Kid LIPS

Students in grades 4-6 will use Achieve 3000

FAST and STAR will be used 3 times a year to progress monitor and adjust instruction needed

Phonics for Reading will be used in grades K-3

Cubed assessments will be given for placement and area of need for any students showing a reading deficiency

Sound Partners will be used for small group intervention

SRA Comprehension will be used for 3-6 students in need of comprehension strengthening

SRA Decoding will be used in grades 3-6 for students who are not proficient with decoding

Title 1 Teachers will do interventions and small group instruction with struggling students

Wilson will be used by trained title 1 teachers for interventions

Acadience will be used with primary students as needed to monitor progress

Data Meetings with grade levels each quarter to discuss goals and current data plans to reach goals

ESOL data meetings to analyze what we can do to better serve these students and strengthen their scores

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading (ELA)

Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction (ELA)

Systematic-explicit-recursive and cumulative phonics instruction (ELA)

Small group instruction

Progress Monitoring

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math Numbers and Operations.

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase proficiency in Numbers and Operations from 66.00% to 70.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Data Monitoring Source: Grade Specific Focus Supporting Larger Goal

FAST K Numbers and Operations

1 Numbers and Operations

2 Numbers and Operations

3 Numbers and Operations

4 Numbers and Operations

5 Numbers and Operations

6 Numbers and Operations

Monitoring:

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

After each FAST testing the data will be reviewed by all grade levels with admin to determine what changes need to be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will give explicit instruction daily using Eureka Squared

Small group instruction will be utilized to fill gaps and enhance tier 1 instruction as needed daily

BEST Standards will be closely followed to ensure strong tier 1 instruction that is focused

Teachers will use manipulatives to enhance student learning and give frequent opportunities to practice

Title I teachers will use small groups to model efficient ways to compute math problems using manipulatives in all parts of life and not just math class

Teachers will use computer based assessments like FAST, Renaissance and I-Ready to guide instruction and to scaffold students at their level for weekly individualized instruction. Headphones and earbuds will be provided for this to ensure the most accurate results and instructions are being given.

Teachers will meet each quarter to discuss data and goal setting/needs assessments to reach goals

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher Modeling

Visual Representations

Frequent Student Practice

Instructional Scaffolding

Integrate Math Instruction Throughout School Day

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students are recognized daily and awarded points using the PBIS app. All teachers can give students points for showing our school mission goals of Be safe, respectful, responsible, and kind. Students are able to earn 4 points a day in their homeroom as well for these. Each quarter these incentive points can be used to shop at the school store.

Students who show a need based on data will receive small group instruction to help close the gap in reading and math. This progress will be monitored on a regular basis by teachers, admin, and the students through data chats.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The students in these subgroups will score above a level 1 in reading and math with these small group interventions in place and being monitored.

Students will receive instruction weekly on Core5 and PowerUp and headphones/earbuds will be provided to ensure this is done in the best setting possible

Primary teachers will use Heggerty and Kid LIPS

Students in grades 4-6 will use Achieve 3000

FAST and STAR will be used 3 times a year to progress monitor and adjust instruction needed

Phonics for Reading will be used in grades K-3

Cubed assessments will be given for placement and area of need for any students showing a reading deficiency

Sound Partners will be used for small group intervention

SRA Comprehension will be used for 3-6 students in need of comprehension strengthening

SRA Decoding will be used in grades 3-6 for students who are not proficient with decoding

Title 1 Teachers will do interventions and small group instruction with struggling students

Wilson will be used by trained title 1 teachers for interventions

Acadience will be used with primary students as needed to monitor progress

Data Meetings with grade levels each quarter to discuss goals and current data plans to reach goals

ESOL data meetings to analyze what we can do to better serve these students and strengthen their scores

Teachers will give explicit instruction daily using Eureka Squared

Small group instruction will be utilized to fill gaps and enhance tier 1 instruction as needed daily

BEST Standards will be closely followed to ensure strong tier 1 instruction that is focused

Teachers will use manipulatives to enhance student learning and give frequent opportunities to practice

Title 1 teachers will use small groups to model efficient ways to compute math problems using manipulatives in all parts of life and not just math class

Teachers will use computer based assessments like FAST, Renaissance and I-Ready to guide instruction and to scaffold students at their level for weekly individualized instruction. Headphones and earbuds will be provided for this to ensure the most accurate results and instructions are being given.

Teachers will meet each quarter to discuss data and goal setting/needs assessments to reach goals

Monitoring:

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

Students will be tracked and monitored through mastery test each month and 3 times a year using state testing

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Harrison (kristen.harrison@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

SRA decoding, SRA comprehension, Sound Partners, Building Fact Fluency, SIPPS, FCRR resources, Spelling through Morphographs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

READING

Taken from the RAISE SIP ELA Focus Chart.

Specific Relation

Evidence-based Strategy

(5 Components of Reading)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

ELA: Improving Reading

Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading: adaptive blended learning program

Systematic and structured approach to six areas of reading: phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, structural analysis, automaticity/fluency, and comprehension.

Lexia Core5 (Strong Evidence for All struggling students):

Implementation Fidelity and student progress monitoring assessed through the DIBELS Next® Assessment

ELA: Improving Reading

Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction:

Phonological awareness only refers to what can be done orally at both the sound and syllabic level. This includes isolating sounds, blending sounds, and orally segmenting words based on syllables. It does not involve print or letter knowledge.

B.E.S.T. ELA Standards – Phonological Awareness

Phonological Awareness and Phonemic awareness instruction (Strong): The National Reading Panel found positive effects of phonemic awareness (PA) instruction on improving students' ability to apply phonemic awareness in their reading and spelling. Learning to manipulate phonemes in words helped the students learn to read.

Explicit, systematic phonological awareness instruction: strong evidence

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence

ELA: Improving Reading

Systematic, explicit, recursive, and cumulative phonics instruction:

Phonics refers to the relationship between graphemes (letters or letter combinations) and phonemes (speech sounds).

B.E.S.T. ELA Standards – Phonics

Explicit, systematic phonics instruction: moderate impact

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence

ELA: Improving Reading

Explicit vocabulary instruction:

morphology (affixes, base words)

language structure

B.E.S.T. ELA Standards - Vocabulary

Explicit vocabulary instruction: strong evidence

ELA: Improving Reading

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, After):

Activate Prior Knowledge

Question Generation

Monitor Comprehension

Identifying the Main Idea

Paraphrasing

Summarizing

B.E.S.T. ELA Standards - Reading Comprehension

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction: strong evidence

*Students who have been explicitly taught multiple comprehension strategies demonstrate greater improvements in reading comprehension. However, students should be proficient with each strategy before they attempt to combine them.

ELA: Improving Reading

Explicit fluency instruction

Accuracy: Accuracy in word reading refers to the ability to decode words correctly and store an accurate representation of the words in memory for instant recall. Accuracy in decoding is the result of secure knowledge of letter-sound associations.

Rate:

Prosody

Fluency teaching activities

Repeated reading

Choral reading

Echo reading

Paired/partner reading

Readers theater

Audio-assisted reading

B.E.S.T. ELA Standards - Fluency

Explicit fluency instruction: strong

*Effective fluency instruction should consider all three aspects of fluency: accuracy, rate, and prosody.

ELA: Improving Reading

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction

Systematic, direct-explicit instruction: strong evidence

ELA: Improving Reading

Small group instruction

Small group instruction: strong evidence

Teacher modeling

Modeling with unambiguous explanations and strong demonstrations that use clear and concise language, variety and active student participation makes instruction more explicit.

Visual representations

Visual models allow students who have difficulty grasping the relationship between math representations and abstract symbols to understand this across math concepts and ideas.

Plan frequent student practice

Providing effective practice opportunities that are both guided and independent helps students develop math proficiency.

Provide instructional scaffolding

Teachers provide support that facilitates students' development of math proficiency.

Prepare problems for use in whole class instruction

Include both routine and non-routine problems to develop proficiency in mathematical problem solving, which better prepares students for advanced mathematics and other complex problem-solving tasks.

Analyzing and discussing solved problems helps students develop a deeper understanding of the logical processes used to solve algebra problems.

Monitor and reflect on the problem-solving process

Monitoring and reflecting during problem solving helps students think about what they are doing and why they are doing it, evaluate the steps they are taking to solve the problem and connect new concepts to what they already know, which will help students master multi-step or complex problems.

Demonstrate multiple problem-solving strategies

Exposing students to problems that are solved using multiple strategies enables students to become more efficient in selecting appropriate ways to solve math problems with greater ease and flexibility.

Recognize and articulate mathematical concepts and notation

Explaining relevant concepts and notation in the context of a problem-solving activity, prompting students to describe how worked examples are solved using mathematically valid explanations, and introducing algebraic notation systematically helps students develop new ways of reasoning, which will help them solve mathematical problems.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Title 1 funding is used to provide highly qualified teachers for small group interventions for black and SWD. Funding is used to purchase materials that are research based and state approved to be used as tier 2 and tier 3 interventions with these subgroups. Students are provided with opportunities to receive free at home supplies and practice materials during school events at the school and during an event at the apartment complex where many of them live. Teacher engagement materials have been purchased with Title I funds to help train teachers in Kagan strategies each month and boost student engagement in class. ESE teachers are using county approved intervention materials purchased by Title I to ensure SWD are receiving specially designed instruction to meet their needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

The area of focus for k-2 is decoding and phonemic awareness. These are the basis for a strong reader so we are using Heggerty in K-3 to strengthen our students phonemic awareness as well as Bridge the Gap as an intervention as needed in small groups to target this area of instruction. We are using strong tier 1 instruction in phonics using From Phonics to Reading for decoding. Students are using Lexia each week as a targeted phonics program as well that meets them at their level. If they need additional support in Lexia they receive small group instruction using Lexia small group teacher led lessons. We are also using SIPPS and Sound Partners as an intervention in the area of phonics to support students who need small groups and are still struggling with phonics in K-2.

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

Third grade students were identified as having 50% or more non proficient. We are targeting these students who show a significant reading deficiency with using the Cubed testing to identify if it's a decoding or comprehension issue. According to their needs we are placing them in a small group for either SRA decoding or comprehension. These students will receive small group instruction 4 days a

week in these programs. All students in 3-5 are receiving Lexia weekly to meet their individual needs. When necessary students will also receive Lexia teacher led lessons in small group. All students will have SAVVAS for strong tier 1 instruction in ELA. Students in 3rd grade will do Heggerty for additional phonemic awareness instruction to strengthen their reading foundational skills. Students who have shown they have a substantial reading deficiency in grade 3-6 will be Cubed and do small group 4 days a week according whether they need SRA decoding or comprehension to fill their gaps.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Using the Renaissance Star testing our K-2 goals are to move students in the area of basic reading skills from 58% to 65%. We plan to move students from 58% during PM1 to 62% by PM2 and 65% by the end of year testing.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Using the FAST testing in grades 3-6 our goal is to move students from 50% proficiency to 65%. Our plan is to focus on comprehension and move from 50% in PM1 to 58% by PM2 and 65% by PM3 at the end of year testing.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Teachers will meet once a month during T3 meetings with admin to look at data and monitoring of progress. We will use mastery test from interventions, grade level assessments, Acadience, teacher observations, and Cubed testing to monitor the progress of students. Students groups will be fluid to ensure student success and that students who continue to struggle and need further supports receive them. Admin, Title I, general ed teachers, and ESE teachers will discuss students progress, attendance, and engagement monthly at the T3 meetings to ensure communications about progress are shared with all stakeholders. Students will have data chats with teachers about their progress after each testing as well so they know their goals and how to obtain these goals. Parents will also be involved in conferencing, talks, and notes home about student progress toward their goal that way they are aware of the goals and progress towards them.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Harrison , Kristen, kristen.harrison@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

K-6 the evidence based programs being used to meet student needs are SAVVAS, Heggerty, Lexia, Phonics to Reading, SIPPS, Sound Partners, Core5, Spelling Mastery, SRA Decoding, and SRA Comprehension. These programs all meet Florida requirements for evidence based, as well as Clay County, and meet the BEST standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These programs are evidence based, they use explicit and systematic instruction, some use direct instruction for more intensified needs. These address the 5 areas of reading and are proven effective for our target population.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Communication about student progress through data meetings:

Our school has created a Literacy Leadership team that will meet monthly to look at student data in ELA and discuss areas of focus as well as our goals and progress towards them. We will address student gains and what needs to occur for students who are not making progress towards their goal. PMP, MTSS, and specific student needs will be discussed in these meetings to ensure all student needs are being addressed.

Literacy Coaching from a county coach will be done regularly for new teachers to ensure they understand the county and school vision and goals. New teachers will look at data with their coach in addition to their admin and team. The coach will help guide them to make decisions about instruction and set up modeling opportunities for them to see other teachers who are highly effective teachers of ELA for an additional support.

Harrison , Kristen,
kristen.harrison@myoneclay.net

Assessments will occur as a grade level using district programs and these assessments will be analyzed and discussed during team meetings as well as T3 meetings.FAST testing will be discussed and monitored for progress towards the goal during T3 meetings with the grade level, ESE teachers, Title 1 teachers, and admin.

Professional Learning will occur through grade levels data professional learning communities every Wednesday. Grade levels will look at assessments and work samples to monitor progress and make decisions about changes that need to occur to ensure the goal is being moved towards. Communications that need to be addressed with ESE, Title 1, and admin will be discussed so that these needs can be discussed at T3 meetings each month.

Small group instruction

The Literacy Leadership team will look at groups each month and keep them fluid to ensure student growth is occurring.

Literacy coaching will occur as needed to ensure small group programs are being taught by trained teachers with fidelity. The county coaches will be used to train anyone who has not taught a specific program before.

The programs used for small group all have Mastery test built in and will be used as the assessment piece to ensure students are grouped correctly and moving forward as needed.

Professional Learning Communities will occur every Wednesday to ensure communication about assessments given in small groups are being communicated within the grade level. T3 meetings will occur monthly as well to ensure ESE, Title 1, and admin are communicated with about the small groups and student progress in them.

Harrison , Kristen,
kristen.harrison@myoneclay.net

Data meetings each quarter:

The Literacy Leadership team will meet each month to discuss data meetings and the protocols. Needs assessments based on progress towards the goal will be discussed and if changes need to be made within a grade level to ensure better

Harrison , Kristen,
kristen.harrison@myoneclay.net

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

progress towards the goal.

Literacy coaching will be offered to all teachers during the data meeting to be sure all teachers know who they can ask for help with questions and concerns in ELA. Teachers will be able to schedule coaching sessions with district specialist or request additional training for programs they currently teach to ensure all programs are being implemented with fidelity.

Data meetings will be used to look at grade level and state wide assessment results. We will use the data tracking wall in the data room to look at progress towards the goals, address specific students there are concerns about, and what is being done to address student needs for those who are not meeting the goal or progressing towards it.

Professional learning will occur monthly during whole group PLC to address how we look at data, student engagement to help increase learning, Universal Design for Learning, and how we are moving towards our goals as a school.

Black Subgroup

Literacy Leadership will look at the progress monitoring for the black subgroup each month to ensure they are progress towards their goal. If they are not making progress towards their goal the committee will look at changing the intervention being used.

Literacy Coaching will be used to ensure all teachers teaching interventions for this subgroup have been trained and are teaching the intervention programs with fidelity.

Assessments will be given to these students through mastery test in the SRA programs they are receiving. These test will be monitored to be sure the students are progressing as needed to meet proficiency. These students' FAST testing will be monitored 3 times a year to ensure they are making growth. If they are not showing growth the Title 1 team, regular ed. teachers, and ESE teachers will look at if a change of intervention is needed.

Professional Learning will help target these students with student engagement strategies each month using Kagan strategies. A poverty book study will be taking place during quarter 2 to help address high quality instruction in schools with high poverty.

Harrison , Kristen,
kristen.harrison@myoneclay.net

Students with Disabilities

Literacy Leadership team will meet each month to discuss with ESE teachers the progression of Students with Disabilities. The team will look at FAST testing as well as Mastery Test for the programs being taught and teacher assessments to analyze this data.

Literacy Coaching will be available to all ESE teachers to ensure they are trained and teaching the programs with fidelity and that these programs meet their students individual needs.

Assessments will be looked at with ESE teachers on each grade level during T3

Harrison , Kristen,
kristen.harrison@myoneclay.net

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>meetings with regular ed teachers each month to ensure communication about assessments is happening across the board. All stakeholders will give input about the students' progress and if the intervention is working for each student.</p> <p>Professional Learning will take place throughout the year for Kagan engagement strategies during PLC whole group time to ensure all students are actively engaged in their learning. Teachers will learn about Universal Design for Learning each month during PLC whole group. FIN will be brought in at least once during the year to help answer questions and guide ESE teachers in making schedules and reaching all SWD to meet their needs. A poverty book study will be offered to help enhance the ESE teachers and Regular Ed. teachers ability to reach all learners from poverty with high quality instruction. Summer ESE Summit trainings were made available to all ESE teachers and regular ed teachers to help enhance their ability to reach all learners and understand all different modalities of learners.</p>	

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Oakleaf High School

4035 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://ohs.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Oakleaf High School is to provide a safe, appropriate, and effective learning environment that will meet the needs of the students and assist the students in accomplishing educational goals that are significant for the world of work and for higher learning pursuits.

Provide the school's vision statement.

By providing the best education possible, we are giving our students the “armor” to succeed in their lifelong endeavors.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boyack, Matthew	Principal	<p>School Principal Evaluator for: Career Technical Education (CTE), PE, NJROTC, Athletic Director, and Deans. Oversees the following areas: Budget, Hiring, Curriculum Council, SAC, School Improvement Plan, Teacher and Room Assignments, Field Trips, Contracts, and Workers Comp. Rep.</p>
Thompson, Christina	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal 12th Grade Administrator Evaluator for: Algebra 1, Foundations, Geometry, Guidance, AICE, and Credit Recovery. Oversees the following areas: Graduation Rate, Math Proficiency, learning gains, lower quartile, Master Schedule, Principal Reviews, Grad Tracker, Duty Roster, FTE, Guidance/504 Compliance, Edgenuity, Grade Changes, and Title IX Leader.</p>
Haile, Toyia	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal 11th Grade Administrator Evaluator for: Science and ESE Oversees the following areas: ESE, 504 Plans, Biology Proficiency, Advanced Placement Program, Principal Reviews, Professional Development, PBIS, English Language Learners, Summer School Coordinator, Teacher of the Year, School Related Employee of the Year, Teacher Support/Appreciation, and Enrollment Issues.</p>
Linscomb, Lance	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal 10th Grade Administrator Evaluator for: Social Studies, Advanced Math, and Fine Arts. Oversees the following areas: US History Proficiency, US History Learning Gains and Lower Quartile, Facilities, Event Calendar, Parent Academy Coordinator, Work Orders, Custodians, Textbooks, Keys, Drills - Bus/Fire/Lockdown/Weather, Emergency Manual, Threat Assessments Leader, Student Success Leader, School Safety Leader, Out-of-Field Teachers, and ESOL Out-of-Field letters.</p>
McKenzie, Brittany	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal 9th Grade Administrator Evaluator for: English, Intensive Reading, Media Center, and Spanish. Oversees the following areas: ELA Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lower Quartile, FAST and EOC Testing, Property, Literacy Leader, Social Media, Webmaster, Chromebooks, New Teacher Orientation, Planner and Discipline Writer, FIC and Roster Verification.</p>
Ritz, Norman	Teacher, K-12	<p>Writer of the School Improvement Plan, Teacher of AP English Language and Composition, AP Research, and English III. School Advisory Committee Chair, National English Honor Society Advisor, National Beta Club Sponsor, and Miss OHS Director.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

At Oakleaf High School, our School Advisory Council seeks input from our stakeholders, which include the school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, students, and the community. At the start of the year, the SAC leader meets with the school leadership team to discuss potential target areas to focus on. After that initial meeting, the School Improvement Plan is drafted and presented to the leadership team. Once the leadership team approves the plan, it is introduced to the stakeholders at our first SAC meeting. Stakeholders are given an opportunity to voice comments and concerns before approving the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Advisory Council at Oakleaf High School meets quarterly with stakeholders (school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and students) to discuss and monitor the implementation and impact of our Improvement Plan and make revisions as necessary.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	857
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	251
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	318
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	318

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56			54			61		
ELA Learning Gains	52			54			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39			43			46		
Math Achievement*	45			48			59		
Math Learning Gains	51			40			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38			32			35		
Science Achievement*	80			72			75		
Social Studies Achievement*	82			78			83		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	97			98			96		
College and Career Acceleration	69			67			64		
ELP Progress	55			54			41		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	664
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	55			
HSP	63			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	52	39	45	51	38	80	82		97	69	55
SWD	22	30	24	19	37	38	53	65		93	41	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
ELL	25	43	35	39	61		60	78		97	63	55
AMI												
ASN	79	69		69	77		91	90		97	90	
BLK	48	50	35	37	46	29	75	75		96	60	
HSP	51	51	37	47	55	50	77	88		99	74	63
MUL	68	55	46	53	57	50	90	94		100	69	
PAC												
WHT	62	52	47	50	52	48	85	84		98	72	
FRL	46	44	34	36	46	32	71	75		96	65	58

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	54	43	48	40	32	72	78		98	67	54
SWD	23	37	29	21	29	27	45	50		92	26	
ELL	31	51	43	36	37	25	56			100	60	53
AMI												
ASN	61	62		56	47		78	93		100	86	
BLK	45	52	43	39	36	30	62	70		100	60	60
HSP	52	49	46	47	39	31	70	77		99	65	52
MUL	59	64	47	65	65		84	69		100	75	
PAC												
WHT	61	55	40	54	42	32	80	87		96	71	
FRL	45	52	46	41	35	31	68	72		98	55	76

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	56	46	59	53	35	75	83		96	64	41
SWD	25	50	54	24	28	18	54	52		91	35	40
ELL	24	50	56	47	59	50	36	70		82	50	41
AMI												
ASN	78	57		71	64		94	94		100	74	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	50	49	41	53	50	35	70	76		94	58	27
HSP	61	57	58	58	52	31	73	78		96	65	38
MUL	69	62	50	63	63	27	76	91		97	48	
PAC												
WHT	66	60	50	64	53	40	79	90		96	68	
FRL	51	52	48	50	42	26	65	76		95	53	39

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 area of the 2022-23 school year was our Acceleration Points. Acceleration Points are comprised of our Career and Technical Education (CTE) program, Advanced Placement (AP) program, Dual Enrollment (DE), and Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) program. The factors that contributed to this area being the lowest were our CTE and AP program test results being below the state average.

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

The greatest decline was that of our College and Career Acceleration rate was 61.7% which was a 7.1% drop in a year (state average was 63.9%). The drop is partly due to the new procedure of how students are tested. It now takes two years for students to take a certification exam, whereas, in the past, students could test in a year.

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.

Our English Language Proficiency score at Oakleaf High School was 44.2%, and the state average was 21.1%. The factors that contributed to this gap is the use of our ESOL assistants that support our ELL

students and our ELA teachers as they support our students in the classroom. In this category, we are significantly higher than the rest of the state.

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

Our area with the highest growth was in English Language proficiency, which increased from 39.3% to 44.2%. That 4.9% growth is due to our ESOL assistants that work with students while they are learning English and our Reading teachers as they work with our struggling readers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

N/A

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

Our top areas for improvement going into the 2023-24 school year are the areas of:

1. Geometry EOC
2. Acceleration Points
3. ELA-Intensive Reading

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our overall math score increased from 45% to 54% during the 2022-23 school year. We saw dramatic increases in our Algebra I pass rates.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2022-23 school year, Oakleaf High School's proficiency rate in Geometry was 47%. Our goal for the 2023-24 school year is to increase that by 7% to a total of 54% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress through quarterly district-level assessments and common assessments given by teachers and analyzed through common planning and PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Thompson (christina.thompson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through the use of CCSD's Vision for Excellent Instruction, teachers will be expected to focus on four key areas of instruction: Rigor, Engagement, Student Ownership, and Student Demonstration of Understanding. We will emphasize the importance of small-group instruction and remediation techniques catered to individual student needs. Teachers will be given feedback through our walkthrough and evaluation instruments. They will also be provided with common planning time with teachers who teach the same subject-area. We will also carve out one hour weekly for teachers to work together through a Professional Learning Community.

Small-groups are put together based on results from common assessments, and students are paired based on achievement. Teachers will work the room to ensure all groups are monitored and pull students in for one-on-one instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were cultivated through collaboration with district leaders, curriculum specialists, administration, and teacher leaders. Small-group instruction (differentiation) is a research-backed strategy that has shown over time to be effective - especially with students who have struggled previously (e.g., lower-quartile students).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will participate in a book study within the Math Department during PLC time. Teachers will seek new approaches to teach skills to students to seek improvement.

Person Responsible: Christina Thompson (christina.thompson@myoneclay.net)

By When: The book study will be completed in March 2023.

Teachers will conduct a baseline of students' current knowledge of the material and analyze the data through common planning and PLCs.

Person Responsible: Christina Thompson (christina.thompson@myoneclay.net)

By When: Baseline results and analysis completed by September 15, 2023.

Teachers will utilize tools such as Alex to gauge students' knowledge throughout the school year and to focus on areas of need.

Person Responsible: Christina Thompson (christina.thompson@myoneclay.net)

By When: On going throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Acceleration Points, according to the 2022-23 school year, was 64%. This shows that our Acceleration Points dropped from 69% in the 2021-22 school year. Acceleration Points is comprised of Career and Technical Education (CTE), Advanced Placement (AP) courses, Dual Enrollment (DE) courses, and Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) courses.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-24 school year, Oakleaf High School's goal is to increase the area of Acceleration Points by 7%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress through the use of Synergy reports that teachers in our CTE department utilize to track students' progress toward their bundled Industry Service Certification Exams, which is monitored by our CTE Coach, Diana Shier. Our AP department is promoting participation in our AP Capstone program to increase the total amount of students graduating with an AP Capstone Diploma, and the progress made by our AP department is closely monitored by our AP Coordinator, Lucinda Schmehl. Our DE courses are closely monitored by our DE Coordinator, Erin Mitchell, and our AICE program is monitored by our AICE Coordinator, Lauran Stalvey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Boyack (matthew.boyack@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through the use of CCSD's Vision for Excellent Instruction, teachers will be expected to focus on four key areas of instruction: Rigor, Engagement, Student Ownership, and Student Demonstration of Understanding. We will emphasize the importance of small-group instruction and remediation techniques catered to individual student needs. Teachers will be given feedback through our walkthrough and evaluation instruments. They will also be provided with common planning time with teachers who teach the same subject-area. We will also carve out 1 hour per week for teachers to work together through a Professional Learning Community.

Small-groups are put together based on results from common assessments, and students are paired based on achievement. Teachers will work the room to ensure all groups are monitored and pull students in for one-on-one instruction. In classrooms with a support facilitator, interventions will take place one-on-one.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were cultivated through collaboration with district leaders, curriculum specialists, administration, and teacher leaders. Small-group instruction (differentiation) is a research-backed strategy that has shown over time to be effective - especially with students who have struggled previously (e.g., lower-quartile students).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Diana Shier, the CTE Coach will utilize Synergy reports to track students' progress toward their bundled Industry Service Certification Exams.

Person Responsible: Matthew Boyack (matthew.boyack@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, Shier will run the report and report the findings to Mr. Boyack.

Lucinda Schmehl, AP Coordinator, will assist teachers with promoting participation in our AP Capstone program to increase the total amount of students graduating with an AP Capstone Diploma.

Person Responsible: Toyia Haile (toyia.haile@myoneclay.net)

By When: Freshman Parent Night in February, a presentation will have been completed and presented to assist in recruitment.

Erin Mitchell, DE Coordinator, will enroll students into DE courses such as College Success to assist our students in earning college credit in high school.

Person Responsible: Matthew Boyack (matthew.boyack@myoneclay.net)

By When: Mitchell will enroll students in these courses at the start of each semester and report numbers to Mr. Boyack.

Lauran Stalvey, AICE Coordinator, will assist in enrolling students into AICE General Paper, AICE English Language, and AICE US History and prepare teachers to teach these courses in place of our honors courses.

Person Responsible: Matthew Boyack (matthew.boyack@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the start of the school year, data will be analyzed, and students will be placed according to skill level.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our students who are placed in Intensive Reading courses need extra support to help bridge the gaps to perform on grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-24 school year, Oakleaf High School's goal is to increase the area of reading proficiency. By the end of the first semester, our 9th and 10th-grade students will increase at least one level within our Corrective Reading programs. Our 11th and 12th-grade students will reach proficiency on their SAT, ACT, or retakes by the end of their 12th-grade school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress through quarterly district-level assessments and common assessments given by teachers and analyzed through common planning and PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany McKenzie (brittany.mckenzie@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through the use of CCSD's Vision for Excellent Instruction, teachers will be expected to focus on four key areas of instruction: Rigor, Engagement, Student Ownership, and Student Demonstration of Understanding. We will emphasize the importance of smallgroup instruction and remediation techniques catered to individual student needs. Teachers will be given feedback through our walkthrough and evaluation instruments. They will also be provided with common planning time with teachers who teach the same subject-area. We will also carve out 1 hour per week for teachers to work together through a Professional Learning Community.

Small-groups are put together based on results from common assessments, and students are paired based on achievement. Teachers will work the room to ensure all groups are monitored and pull students in for one-on-one instruction. In classrooms with a support facilitator, inventions will take place one-on-one.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were cultivated through collaboration with district leaders, curriculum specialists, administration, and teacher leaders. Small-group instruction (differentiation) is a research-backed strategy that has shown over time to be effective - especially with students who have struggled previously (IE, lower-quartile students).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All Intensive Reading teachers will utilize district-approved resources to track and monitor students' progression.

Person Responsible: Brittany McKenzie (brittany.mckenzie@myoneclay.net)

By When: During PLCs and Common Planning, reading teachers will discuss data and strategies to assist students. On-going throughout the school year.

Teachers will conduct a baseline of students' current knowledge of the material and analyze the data through common planning and PLCs.

Person Responsible: Brittany McKenzie (brittany.mckenzie@myoneclay.net)

By When: Data will be assessed by September 15, 2023.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To combat areas of need and ensure all voices are heard, the D.R.E.A.M (Driven, Reflective, Engaging, Achieving and Meaningful) Team program was created. The D.R.E.A.M Team focuses on bridging the gap between staff, students, and administration in order to create an environment that is conducive to safe, inclusive, strategic, inspiring, engaging, and relevant learning that produces successful results for all. The D.R.E.A.M team includes staff, students, and administration that are driven to make a positive and productive change in the school's climate and culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for student success is to establish effective classroom routines, modify instructional approaches, and build positive rapport. Our goal for teacher/staff retention is to identify resources for morale boosting, ensure school safety, and build a culture of understanding. For all, we want student and teacher academic and personal growth and development.

Monitoring:

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

The purpose of this program is to collect real-time data from our teachers and students on school climate and culture, as well as the effectiveness or lack thereof of our current operations, processes, and procedures in order to develop a strategic action plan to combat areas of need, improve our methods and yield successful academic, retention and climate results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toyia Haile (toyia.haile@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

For years, there have been research-based trainings, books, conferences, and more looking at teacher retention, student learning gaps, and climate and culture. We all know this issue runs hand in hand, and we as a collective educational community can train all day, read books, and study different strategies to combat this real issue. However, we want to take it a step further at Oakleaf High School, and instead of looking at others' research, why not get insight and solutions from those whom we work with the closest. Our community is different; our students and teachers face various challenges that are unique to them, the community, and our school. Thus, we need to get information as to the root cause directly from our teachers, students, and even parents. To ensure true and successful change, we must first look within.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The team meets to discuss the school's current state of progress, including areas such as instructional pedagogy, attendance, behaviors, climate and culture, safety concerns, retention, and school operations. The team establishes a list of solutions based on the conversations that can assist with improving areas of need to create a strategic plan to put in action.

Teachers' voices - Educators are able to provide insight into factors that affect morale at the school and how that plays a part in retention. In addition, strategies and ideas are shared with the admin to either improve retention or maintain it.

Student voices - Students provide admin and teachers insight into some of the background causes of decreased attendance, increased behavioral issues, and learning gaps.

Admin voices - Administrators serve as the gatekeepers of school climate and culture by being open-minded, good listeners, implementers, and a liaison between the school and stakeholders.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Mrs. Haile will meet with PBIS leaders to discuss expectations for the D.R.E.A.M. Team.

Person Responsible: Toyia Haile (toyia.haile@myoneclay.net)

By When: August 7, 2023, during Pre-Planning.

Mrs. Haile will meet with the D.R.E.A.M. team monthly to discuss the process of the implementation of the new initiative.

Person Responsible: Toyia Haile (toyia.haile@myoneclay.net)

By When: Fourth Thursday of the month throughout the school year.

Members of the D.R.E.A.M. Team will participate in a book study to seek new approaches to teach skills to students to seek improvement.

Person Responsible: Toyia Haile (toyia.haile@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, completion in May 2023.

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Oakleaf Junior High

4085 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://olj.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Oakleaf Junior High School is to provide a safe, appropriate, and effective learning environment that will meet the needs of students and assist students in the accomplishment of educational goals that are significant in the workplace and for higher learning pursuits.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Oakleaf Junior High exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dixon, Wilnitra	Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and insure proper security, maintenance and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including: interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, ELL, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, F.A.S.T. Assessments, End-of-Course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students and community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the school district.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Freeman, Josh	Assistant Principal	<p>Manages school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place. Collaborates with the School Principal to generate a master schedule in alignment with District and State expectations for student achievement. Ensure appropriate staff members are trained for the administration of local and state assessments for students. Serves as a lead for PLC content area groups. In addition, serves as an active member of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), Administrative Team, and conducts classroom walkthroughs to provide teachers with instructional support.</p>
LaFontant, Florence	Assistant Principal	<p>Manages school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place. Collaborates with the School Principal to determine core needs for Support Facilitators and self contained classrooms to ensure student needs are met for students with disabilities. Serves as a lead for PLC content area groups. Serves as an active member of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), Administrative Team, and conducts classroom walkthroughs to provide teachers with instructional support. In addition, Mrs. Lafontant manages student discipline concerns and serves as the lead for the PBIS team.</p>
Elia, Mike	Assistant Principal	<p>Manages school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place. Collaborates with the School Principal to determine core needs for Support Facilitators and self contained classrooms to ensure student needs are met for students with disabilities. Serves as a lead for PLC content area groups. Mr. Elia is the chairperson for the School Safety Team, by leading the team with the completion of threat assessments. Serves as the lead for compliance of school drills and documentation. Also, collaborates with the district to ensure proper maintenance of school facilities with the completion of work orders. Serves as an active member of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), Administrative Team, and conducts classroom walkthroughs to provide teachers with instructional support. In addition, manages student discipline concerns and assists as an active member of the PBIS team.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Improvement Plan is constructed utilizing input from the School Advisory Council (SAC). The SAC consists of school administrators, instructional staff, support staff, parents, and business partners from the community. Input from members of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), the Literacy Team, Positive Behavior & Intervention Supports (PBIS) Team, school administrators, and instructional staff feedback gathered from end of year meetings. Each team and department will utilize action planning templates to provide ongoing feedback for mid-year updates and the construction of the next school improvement plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored on a monthly basis using the following methods:

- *SAC meetings-school-wide data will be provided for review, discussion, and next steps
- *School committee meetings (PBIS, Literacy, SBLT)
- *The Oakleaf Junior High Professional Learning Community (PLC)
- *School Based Leadership Team Meetings(SBLT)
- *School Data Reviews (quarterly)
- *Administration Team Meetings (weekly)

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	112	204	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	110	230	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	126	180	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	77	108	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	117	194	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	62	109	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	111	173	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	70	102	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	130	283	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	94	189

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	62	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	111	173
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	70	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	130	283

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	94	189

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57			55			61		
ELA Learning Gains	50			50			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33			41			53		
Math Achievement*	58			50			67		
Math Learning Gains	56			32			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49			27			56		
Science Achievement*	62			60			69		
Social Studies Achievement*	81			78			83		
Middle School Acceleration	63			62			68		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	44			39			58		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	49			
HSP	56			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	57	50	33	58	56	49	62	81	63			44
SWD	22	35	26	29	45	44	32	64	36			
ELL	41	43	33	36	51	50	44	83	40			44
AMI												
ASN	83	65		88	79		90	95	89			
BLK	48	44	26	43	54	48	46	72	56			
HSP	58	49	36	57	52	46	61	88	58			
MUL	61	51	29	56	56	46	66	81	58			
PAC												
WHT	62	53	43	70	57	51	76	86	64			
FRL	50	42	27	49	50	48	51	74	47			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	55	50	41	50	32	27	60	78	62			39
SWD	23	35	31	15	20	22	27	52	23			
ELL	25	44	46	34	37	48	35	65	27			39
AMI												
ASN	78	67		69	33		74	95	73			
BLK	41	41	35	33	25	18	46	71	46			
HSP	52	55	52	49	37	39	57	75	68			29
MUL	54	52	29	54	33	24	63	77	70			
PAC												
WHT	67	54	48	63	37	37	73	86	66			
FRL	44	41	38	38	29	27	48	71	47			27

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	61	53	67	70	56	69	83	68			58
SWD	24	43	36	28	54	49	37	56	41			
ELL	21	53	56	25	63	71	17	76				58
AMI												
ASN	72	58		82	77		74	88	88			
BLK	52	55	49	51	63	56	58	78	67			
HSP	62	61	60	68	72	56	65	86	66			43
MUL	68	61	47	77	77	73	79	85	70			
PAC												
WHT	68	66	59	79	74	54	79	86	68			
FRL	51	55	45	58	66	56	55	76	60			47

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Based on the review of the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. scores, proficiency in ELA/Reading showed the lowest performance. Both 7th and 8th grade students demonstrated 50% proficiency overall. Contributing factors include the following: limited numbers of Support Facilitators to push into classrooms with students needing support, adjustment to a new testing platform/format, leveling of student classes, and unfilled teaching positions within multiple subject areas for the entire school year.

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

Overall student proficiency decreased from 57% to 50% from the prior year assessment. Contributing factors to this result include the following: limited numbers of Support Facilitators to push into classrooms to provide support for students with disabilities, adjustment to a new testing platform/format, leveling of student classes, and unfilled teaching positions within multiple subject areas for the entire school year. Nearly 36% of all students are identified as students with disabilities.

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.

In comparison with the state average in the following areas: Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary, Reading Informational Text, and Reading Prose and Poetry, there is no significant gap between student performance at Oakleaf Junior High and the state average. In fact, 8th grade students out performed the state with proficiency scores that were three to four percentage points higher in each area.

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

Overall student proficiency in Math showed the most improvement with an 11 point increase from the 2022-2023 school year. The incorporation of the Math Lab for students to receive additional support outside of the math content class time. Student attendance and work were tracked by the Math Lab teacher. In addition, the Math Lab teacher collaborated with the math department Professional Learning Community (PLC) throughout the year to ensure consistency for student learning during lab time. The math department also restructured the PLC by collaborating to develop a vision statement for the math department. The vision focused on what teachers want math classes to look like when observing student work and teacher work. Support Facilitators were consistent with push in support to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Students with disabilities were also served by certified ESE teachers within a Unique Skills course with provided extra support for students to complete assignments in a smaller classroom setting. In addition, student work protocols and common assessment data reviews were held. The renewed Math PLC structured resulted in smaller teacher groups that allowed for collaboration among teachers covering the same math course. This allowed additional structure for teachers to talk through strategies used to teach concepts along with a detailed look at student learning trends across the classes. Included in the PLC with the math department are the ESE Support Facilitators, District Math Curriculum Specialist, and the Math Department Administrator. Teachers were then able to construct common math assessments based on current student progress and learning trends for the following meeting.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on Early Warning Systems data, two areas of concern have been identified. The two areas of concern are students that scored a Level 1 in math and ELA/Reading and student attendance below 90%. This is an area of concern due to the number of students performing at a level 1 on the F.A.S.T. Math and ELA/Reading assessments. The data identifies a total of 85 students who earned a Level 1 in both Math and ELA Reading assessments. Within this group 23 of these students are also have attendance that is below 90% for the 2022-2023 school year.

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

1. Student Attendance: Students with attendance rates below 90% will be targeted early to identify barriers that prevent school attendance, clear communication of expectations, and guidance through Student Success Team meetings for families with input from teachers. The school social worker will collaborate with school administrators, school counselors, and teachers to gather input for families to support students.
2. Support Facilitation for Exceptional Education: Students with Individual Education Plans will receive increased levels of support in the math and ELA classrooms with the addition of two more Support Facilitators and intentional scheduling. Some students enrolled in dual certified classes will also benefit from the services of support facilitators in math and/or ELA classes. Whole group collaboration sessions through monthly "Consultation Breakfasts" provides all teachers with the opportunity to connect with the entire team of ESE Support Facilitators and school counselors regarding student progress. Teachers have the opportunity to provide support facilitators with input about student progress while gathering any updates about student plans.
3. Intensive Reading Classes: Students with Level 1 and Level 2 ELA/Reading scores were enrolled into Intensive Reading classes. Due to class and size limitations, students with Level 1 scores were given priority with scheduling. Every student completed a diagnostic to determine placement within specific classes based on levels for the Corrective Reading program. The Corrective Reading program is used for all intensive reading classes. Students identified as active English Language Learners were scheduled into ESOL Intensive Reading classes. ESOL Intensive Reading classes are leveled to meet the needs of all students.
4. Math Support: Student results from the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. Math assessment were reviewed with the math department and administration. Students were scheduled into math classes in accordance with the scheduling guidelines provided by the school district. The Math Lab is maintained by a certified math teacher who serves as a member of the Math Department and Math PLC. The math lab teacher collaborates with math teachers to identify students that need additional math support based on assessments and checks for understanding throughout the course. In addition, F.A.S.T. scores were used to immediately identify Level 1 students who earned a year-long average below a "C". Students attend the math lab for one to two days a week during an elective class to prevent loss of math instructional time. The math lab teacher completed a tour of all math classes at the start of the year to touch base with all students. Students in advanced classes may also attend math lab sessions for support on the assigned days for advanced courses throughout the school year. The math lab teacher maintains student math lab attendance records and tracks student data (grades, Aleks performance, and Progress Monitoring) for the entire year.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The objective to establishing an effective school-wide discipline plan is to have well defined expectations, ensure consistency with enforcement, and possess the ability to develop and emphasize proactive strategies rather than reactive ones along a continuum of positive behavior supports. An emphasis should be placed on utilizing an instructional and inclusionary approach to discipline, as opposed to reinforcing exclusionary disciplinary practices. Oakleaf Junior High has established H.I.V.E. (Honor, Integrity, Value, and Excellence) as a guide for all staff to outline and students to follow daily.

Establishing and maintaining consistent school-wide expectations with classrooms in alignment will improve student achievement. The objective is to provide structure and consistency in addition to opportunities for student reflection about behaviors. Students will complete lessons and receive support/mentorship throughout the school year in the form of Student Success Teams for any of the following areas: attendance, behaviors, and academic grades. The overall goal is to keep students within active learning environments to maximize learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The objective is to decrease the number of student office referrals for "Defiance and Disrespect" from the previous school year. The PBIS team initiative for consistent school-wide behavior expectations is in place to outline steps for students that need to be redirected while rewarding students for making good choices.

Monitoring:

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

The number of discipline referrals will be tracked using Synergy reports. The PBIS team will continue the tradition of sharing student office discipline referrals quarterly during whole group staff meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Florence LaFontant (florence.lafontant@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Oakleaf Junior High has established H.I.V.E. (Honor, Integrity, Value, and Excellence) as a guide for all staff to outline and students to follow daily. Based on Early Warning System data from the 2022-2023 school year, there was a total of 140 students with disabilities identified that were suspended. Of the 140 students identified, 60 served 1 or more days in In School Suspension (ISS) and 39 served 1 or more days in Out of School Suspension (OSS).

H.I.V.E. expectations have been printed and posted in highly visible areas to outline positive behavior choices for various areas of the school (Gym/Locker Rooms, Cafeteria, Classroom, and Hallways). Students can receive HIVE Coins to purchase items from the HIVE Mart and/or be recognized as the HIVE Student of the Week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of outlining and posting expectations is for students to have a clear, consistent understanding of behavior expectations school-wide. Students receive guidance on the second day of school and again in January to refresh school expectations for good behavior. Examples of expectations

(good choices) and behaviors that are prohibited for clarity. The objective is to ensure students are aware of expectations to reduce the number of infractions to prevent instructional time lost due to suspensions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Establish Positive Behavior Intervention Support Team with instructional and support staff members.
2. Create list of positive behavior expectations for specific areas: hallways, classrooms, cafeteria, etc.
3. Post positive behavior expectations in visible areas for students. Provide posters for each classroom.
4. Complete PBIS follow up training with team members.
5. Introduce students to expectations during Buzz Camp (July).
6. Share procedures and plan with staff during pre-planning week.
7. Conduct beginning of year assembly to outline positive expectations for students.
8. Provide staff members with H.I.V.E. Coins to reward positive student behavior.
9. Open the H.I.V.E. Mart during lunch periods for students to use H.I.V.E. coins.
10. Administration collaboration with Dean of Student Culture to develop plan to track student discipline. Student discipline referral data is shared quarterly during a Whole Group meeting. Follow up with meetings to review data and plan next steps to meet student needs.

Person Responsible: Florence LaFontant (florence.lafontant@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monitoring and feedback occur monthly during PBIS team meetings and quarterly with a whole group PLC meeting.

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall student proficiency in Math showed the most improvement with an 11 point increase from the 2022-2023 school year. Students with disabilities were also served by certified ESE teachers within a Unique Skills course with provided extra support for students to complete assignments in a smaller classroom setting. In addition, student work protocols and common assessment data reviews were held.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goals for the 2023-2024 school year are:

1. Increase student proficiency on the Math 2 F.A.S.T. Assessment from 45% to 50%.
2. Increase student proficiency on the Math 3 F.A.S.T. Assessment from 60% to 65%.
3. Increase student proficiency on the Algebra EOC from 96% to 98%.
4. Increase student proficiency on the Geometry EOC from 99% to 100%

Monitoring:

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

1. Use of the Math Lab during elective classes to provide students with additional support.
2. Classroom Walkthroughs
3. Professional Learning Community for Math teachers to address the following essential questions:
 - *What do we want students to learn?
 - *How will we know when students have learned the material?
 - *What do we respond to students who do not learn the material?
 - *How will we push students who have mastered/learned the material?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Support Facilitator push in support for Inclusion and Dual Certified math classrooms.
2. Math Lab for students to receive math tutoring for work completion and to re-teach math concepts during the school day outside of the math class.
3. Unique Skills class for students with individual education plan to receive small group support in the areas of math and ELA.
4. Professional Learning Community with a renewed vision for math instruction for the department.
5. Administrator Walkthroughs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The incorporation of the Math Lab for students to receive additional support outside of the math content class time. Student attendance and work were tracked by the Math Lab teacher. In addition, the Math Lab teacher collaborated with the math department Professional Learning Community (PLC) throughout the year to ensure consistency for student learning during lab time.

The vision focused on what teachers want math classes to look like when observing student work and teacher work. Support Facilitators were consistent with push in support to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The renewed Math PLC resulted in smaller teacher groups that allowed collaboration among teachers covering the same math course. The additional structure for teachers to talk through strategies

used to teach concepts along with a detailed look at student learning trends across the classes. The PLC will include ESE Support Facilitators, District Math Curriculum Specialist, and the Math Department Administrator. The use of common assessments will help teachers define and track trends.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Consistently conduct walkthroughs with intentional focus areas based on the OneClay Instructional Vision and provide teachers with next steps to foster best practices to maximize student learning during the

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Walkthroughs will occur on a daily basis. Administration will have weekly meetings to review classroom walkthrough trends. Prescribed next steps review and teacher follow up will occur weekly.

Work collaboratively with content area curriculum specialists (Matz & Randall) and Support Facilitator to ensure the continuous development of effective instructional strategies in alignment with the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards. This will be monitored with regular attendance and assistance with teacher development during Content Area PLC time as a small group team by specific math course, whole group with best practices for instruction centered around the quarterly focus outlined in the OneClay Vision for Strong Instruction, and during all day trainings with the content area specialists.

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: This will be monitored and feedback will be provided on a monthly basis.

Monitor student attendance to Math Lab and progress based on student grades and progress monitoring assessments. During the first quarter, students with a Level 1 on the F.A.S.T. PM 3 Assessment and students with a "D" average for the previous year will be pulled for math lab assistance two days a week during an elective class.

Additional students will be pulled based on need and the math lab teacher will collaborate with the math department during PLC planning time to ensure alignment within the curriculum guide and review student data.

A "Zero Detention" option is also available for students to attend the math lab to complete missing assignments once a week.

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly based on student need.

Utilize data from Progress Monitoring assessments 1 and 2 in addition to the review of student work on checks for understanding and/or classroom assessments to identify trends in student performance. Monthly content PLC meetings will include Support Facilitators to discuss student progress and needs. This data will be used to determine next steps regarding opportunities to reteach lessons, math lab assistance, and/or needed teacher development in the content area to increase student achievement in math.

Person Responsible: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

By When: February 2024

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall student proficiency decreased from 57% to 50% from the prior year assessment. Contributing factors to this result include the following: limited numbers of Support Facilitators to push into classrooms to provide support for students with disabilities, adjustment to a new testing platform/format, leveling of student classes, and unfilled teaching positions within multiple subject areas for the entire school year. Nearly 36% of all students are identified as students with disabilities. A total of 73 students identified as students with disabilities scored a Level 1 on the ELA/Reading F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase overall proficiency from 50% to 55% for both 7th and 8th grade students.

Monitoring:

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

The following steps will be used to monitor student performance in ELA/Reading.

1. Classroom Walkthroughs Intensive Reading Classes
2. Monitoring/tracking student progress in the Intensive Reading student data dashboard, Lexia, Progress Monitoring Assessments, and Synergy student grade reports
3. Support Facilitator push in support for ELA classrooms to meet student needs during whole and small group learning opportunities
4. Data chats
5. Professional Learning Community activities for collaborative planning and review of student data
6. ELA and Intensive Reading team collaboration with district specialists regarding planning, best instructional practices, curriculum materials, and lesson suggestions when needed for support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wilnitra Dixon (wilnitra.dixon@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Corrective Reading program in use for Intensive Reading classes
2. Classroom Walkthroughs
3. Professional Learning Community for ELA and Reading teachers to address the following essential questions:
 - *What do we want students to learn?
 - *How will we know when students have learned the material?
 - *What do we respond to students who do not learn the material?
 - *How will we push students who have mastered/learned the material?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy allows teachers and administrators to make decisions for next steps instructionally based on current student data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Include ELA teachers and support facilitators in the decision making process of student placement in the master schedule. Support facilitators will assist with the outline of dual certification and support facilitator push in classrooms during the initial stages of master schedule development. This will assist with creating a schedule that maximizes student support within the classroom.
2. Classroom Walkthroughs Intensive Reading Classes and support from district specialist for training based on teacher need.
3. Use student data gathered from the Intensive Reading student data dashboard, Lexia, and Progress Monitoring Assessments to determine student and teacher needs.
4. Support Facilitator push in support for ELA classrooms to meet student needs during whole and small group learning opportunities
5. Professional Learning Community activities for collaborative planning and review of student data.

Person Responsible: Wilnitra Dixon (wilnitra.dixon@myoneclay.net)

By When: February 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Resources Needed

*Chromebooks and charging carts to replace outdated devices to meet requirements of the new state assessment platform to complete F.A.S.T. assessments.

Review of School Improvement Funding

- 1-Review of need and resources with the School Based Leadership Team as department chairs will survey teams with needs assessment. The request must align with any of the three objectives for improvement outlined in the SIP. Administration will draft the proposal for funding.
- 2-The proposal will be shared with the School Advisory Council for review and vote.
- 3-The result will be shared with the SBLT for final consensus.
- 4-Items funded and usage/results will be shared with updates at SAC meetings.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring**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 impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf Village Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Oakleaf Village Elementary School

410 OAKLEAF VILLAGE PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://ove.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant, and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oakleaf Village Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and insure proper security, maintenance and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including: interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments.</p>
Martin, Jason	Principal	<p>Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Standards Assessments, End-of-course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement.</p> <p>Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students and community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.
Lester, Shelley	Assistant Principal	Manage school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place
Gilliam, Chernell	Assistant Principal	Manage school facility and staff to ensure student safety and grade appropriate level instruction takes place
Taylor, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Russo, Jane	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Hammer, Penny	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Kendall, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Devine, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Mason, Krystal	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Peterson, Lily	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Abramowich, Stanley	Teacher, K-12	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Lively, Pamela	Teacher, ESE	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Wallace, Anthony	School Counselor	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Lundy, Kim	School Counselor	Disseminate information from Administration. Manage grade level activities. Ensure team has materials to ensure grade appropriate instruction takes place. Assist with collaborative groups to support OVE's Professional Learning Community.
Mosley, Beth	Teacher, K-12	Teacher
Guin, Carri	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Administration, emerging leaders, and the school advisory council (including parents) were solicited advice on how they think the school should focus its improvement efforts.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

This plan will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs. We will also convene as administration & grade level teams for quarterly data progression meetings to evaluate student growth based on I-Ready, Acadience, & FAST assessment scores, teacher-developed common assessment scores, MTSS students' progress monitoring data, and teacher-provided samples of student work on grade-level standards. We will be conducting weekly gradual release administration-modeled PLCs focused on grade level-wide proficiency of essential ELA standards to ensure all staff are involved in the growth of students across the entire building.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	28	27	21	26	22	18	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	6	15	5	12	0	0	44
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	16	16	8	16	5	2	0	0	63
Course failure in Math	0	11	19	2	14	2	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	19	17	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	22	21	25	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	17	20	0	0	42

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	15	11	13	14	20	0	0	78

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	28	27	21	26	22	18	17	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	5	1	6	15	5	12	25	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	16	16	8	16	5	2	10	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	11	19	2	14	2	0	6	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	17	18	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	21	25	15	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	17	20	17	0	0	59

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	6	10	13	11	13	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	28	27	21	26	22	18	17	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	5	1	6	15	5	12	25	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	16	16	8	16	5	2	10	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	11	19	2	14	2	0	6	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	17	18	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	21	25	15	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	17	20	17	0	0	59

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	6	10	13	11	13	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65			67			67		
ELA Learning Gains	63			63			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			38			48		
Math Achievement*	65			64			75		
Math Learning Gains	67			54			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59			29			47		
Science Achievement*	67			59			68		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	50			62			55		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	52			
HSP	66			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	61			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	63	53	65	67	59	67					50
SWD	44	50	36	44	53	39	46					
ELL	35	58	47	41	58	45						50
AMI												
ASN	68	77		74	77							
BLK	53	55	41	53	58	51	52					
HSP	61	70	65	67	74	71	62					55
MUL	68	72		66	64							
PAC												
WHT	78	62	77	74	71	46	76					
FRL	58	64	55	58	62	58	74					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	63	38	64	54	29	59					62
SWD	41	38	41	38	30	23	26					
ELL	27	55		45	36							62
AMI												
ASN	76			86								
BLK	49	50	38	36	31	22	21					
HSP	67	60	42	68	55	30	71					60
MUL	80	76		66	45		70					
PAC												
WHT	77	69	40	77	66	41	75					
FRL	59	60	46	51	44	24	46					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	61	48	75	66	47	68					55
SWD	46	53	48	50	50	39	46					
ELL	31	55		62	67							55
AMI												
ASN	73	70		91	78		100					
BLK	53	56	40	57	55	40	52					
HSP	65	62	50	78	70	40	62					
MUL	68	67	70	68	58	33	70					
PAC												
WHT	77	61	52	84	72	63	78					
FRL	57	53	43	64	59	37	50					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

OVE's lowest-performing data component is fifth-grade science proficiency. ELL and SWD subgroup student populations have the lowest science proficiency scores and lowest quartile learning gain percentages. Some of the contributing factors include lower student attendance.

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

The school's science achievement data declined by 11% from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. The school experienced a change in instructors and instructional techniques.

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.

Our ELA proficiency data declined by 4%. Having been above the state average, any decline is cause for concern and in particular, a decline that would bring you in line with state averages is concerning

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is math proficiency increasing by 3%. Identifying the Math needs and adjusting instruction to meet those needs for each student according to the data was a contributing factor to this improvement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on the EWS data, two potential areas of concern are chronic absenteeism and the number of students who have been identified as having a substantial reading deficiency.

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

- 1) Continue to increase the proficiency of students in science.
- 2) Increasing student growth and proficiency in reading across all grade levels.
- 3) Utilizing the new Eureka Squared curriculum to teach to the Florida Math BEST standards.
- 4) Decrease the number of students with attendance below 90%.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Since this is the second year for Math BEST standards and the first year with the new Eureka Squared curriculum, our focus needs to be on properly using the systems we have in place (curriculum, curriculum maps, B1G M, PLC time, etc.) to improve and align our instructional practice to match the new standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase of 3 percentage points in proficiency for all scholars from 68% to 71% to earn a school grade of an A.

Monitoring:

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

We will use mid and end-of-module Eureka Squared assessments and FAST beginning, middle, and end-of-year assessments to monitor the progress of our students. We will use daily exit tickets during lessons to monitor progress prior to summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented are the small group instruction and remediation given to students based on the data collected during daily exit tickets. In addition, this instruction will happen with the use of effective district newly-adopted curriculum, Eureka Squared.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials, our students will show improvement in the area of math. The resources we will implement include highly effective teachers with proper training and knowledge of the math standards in addition the the use of the newly adopted curriculum.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

- 1) Professional development/training on math BEST standards and Eureka Squared curriculum will be highly encouraged for all math teachers
- 2) Common planning
- 3) Utilize district curriculum specialists

Person Responsible: Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A review of the state testing data shows room for improvement across the tested grade bands with regards to the school's ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

OVE's goal is to increase proficiency in each of the tested grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th) by 2% and a specific 4% improvement in the ESE population and 4% in the ELL population.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through school-wide testing using the FAST and Acadience progress monitoring scores, as well as Savvas testing platform incorporated with the curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ELA teachers will utilize the CUBE assessment, Savvas ELA curriculum, and Tier II and Tier III interventions via the MTSS process to review and remediate students demonstrating deficiencies. ESE and ESOL teachers & assistants will utilize the same resources to develop goals written into IEPs/ILPs, remediate based on the goals, and document growth for students specific to the subgroup they are responsible for.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increase reading proficiency will lead to increase proficiency in all other subjects. Weekly school-wide PLC time will be used to emphasize 4 essential standards per grade level for ELA per year. With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of ELA. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include Savvas, Phonics to Reading, Heggerty, Spelling & Morphology, Kid Lips, and Lexia Core 5.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

- 1) Common planning
- 2) Professional development available and highly encouraged for all teachers new to teaching ELA and/or

the following curriculums: Savvas, Phonics to reading, Kid Lips, Heggerty, Spelling Morphology, and Lexia Core 5.

3) Utilize district curriculum specialists

4) Emphasis of four ELA essential standards per grade level throughout the year during PLC

Person Responsible: Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the past several years since 2020, attendance has become seemingly optional. We are using tangible incentives and creating excitement for scholars surrounding learning. We are also continuing our student success team meetings to work with families to increase scholar attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In analyzing our attendance overall data from last year: 81% of scholars had 90 - 100% attendance, 15% at 80 - 89% attendance, 2% at 70-79% attendance, and 6 (or less than 1%) at 60-68% attendance. This year we aim to increase our 90-100% attendance range by 3% points.

Monitoring:

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

OVE PBIS team will meet monthly on the first Tuesday of the month. The PBIS team consists of the guidance counselor, administrator, and teachers from each grade level. Teachers provide input via a Google Form and in the Contact Log of Synergy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Creating a positive school and class environment will impact students' will to attend school. We will use positive reinforcements, recognition, and family positive notes. This year we have also increased opportunities for activities (art club, robotics, music) which we hope to create experiences students will want to experience.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As shared by Attendance Works, schools can increase attendance by creating a welcoming environment that emphasizes building relationships with families and stresses the importance of going to class every day. "The key is developing a school-wide school culture that promotes a sense of safety, respect, and personal responsibility, where students feel connected and know that someone notices, in a caring manner, when they missed school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Recognize when students are consistently present. Students with attendance of 95% or higher for each nine weeks will be awarded: a certificate at an awards ceremony, positive notes and calls home, and a

thank you note for parents.

Identify students who are not consistently present. We will follow the district flow chart for attendance. Teachers will call home after 3 absences. Notations will be made in Synergy. The attendance team will meet monthly to contact families at risk.

Person Responsible: Jason Martin (jason.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Orange Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Orange Park Elementary School

1401 PLAINFIELD AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ope.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to always work collaboratively with all of our community resources and stakeholders. We will increase achievement among our students with opportunities surrounding learning that are relevant, rigorous, and will transcend beyond the boundaries of our school walls. Our working and learning environment will be built upon honesty, integrity and respect. With all of the above Orange Park Elementary will maximize student potential and also promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Orange Park Elementary exists to prepare lifelong learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring all applicable life skills. We will provide an experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wood, Tyler	Principal	<p>The School Principal is responsible to the Superintendent of Schools. Our duties include but are not limited to compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, partnerships with all stakeholders, & communications with parents, students and teachers. We coordinate and monitor curricular programs to maximize student learning, efficient utilization of school facilities to insure proper security, and monitor the timely submission of required school records. We provide leadership and direction with respect to professional development through activities that encourage instructional growth, manage business operations, and provide a safe learning environment for all. We are also responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations, proper receipt and accounting practices, and purchase of all instructional materials used by instructional employees.</p>
Pfundner, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	<p>Mrs. Pfuntner is responsible for establishing a classroom climate conducive to learning, demonstrating an interest in and willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom environment, meeting the social/emotional and physical needs of her students, preparation of the classroom environment, understanding her content area, providing for students of varying ability through use of a variety of activities, exhibiting good judgement, communicating effectively with others and evaluating student's progress throughout the year. As department head, she is responsible for leading her department and setting a strong example of highly effective instruction for those she leads. Currently, Mrs. Pfuntner works with our kindergarten students at OPE.</p>
Dougherty, LeeAnne	Teacher, K-12	<p>Mrs. Dougherty is responsible for establishing a classroom climate conducive to learning, demonstrating an interest in and willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom environment, meeting the social/emotional and physical needs of her students, preparation of the classroom environment, understanding her content area, providing for students of varying ability through use of a variety of activities, exhibiting good judgement, communicating effectively with others and evaluating student's progress throughout the year. As department head, she is responsible for leading her department and setting a strong example of highly effective instruction for those she leads. Currently, Mrs. Dougherty works with our second grade students at OPE.</p>
Doty, Robin	Teacher, K-12	<p>Mrs. Doty is responsible for establishing a classroom climate conducive to learning, demonstrating an interest in and willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom environment, meeting the social/emotional and physical needs of her students, preparation of the classroom environment, understanding her content area, providing for students of varying ability through use of a variety of activities, exhibiting good judgement, communicating effectively with others and evaluating student's progress throughout the year. As department head, she is responsible for leading her department and setting a strong example of highly effective</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>instruction for those she leads. Currently, Mrs. Doty works with our fourth grade students at OPE.</p>
<p>Geeser, Molly</p>	<p>Teacher, K-12</p>	<p>Mrs. Geeser is responsible for establishing a classroom climate conducive to learning, demonstrating an interest in and willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom environment, meeting the social/emotional and physical needs of her students, preparation of the classroom environment, understanding her content area, providing for students of varying ability through use of a variety of activities, exhibiting good judgement, communicating effectively with others and evaluating student's progress throughout the year. As department head, she is responsible for leading her department and setting a strong example of highly effective instruction for those she leads. Currently, Mrs. Geeser works with our fifth grade students at OPE.</p>
<p>Harris, Chris</p>	<p>Teacher, K-12</p>	<p>Mr. Harris is responsible for establishing a classroom climate conducive to learning, demonstrating an interest in and willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom environment, meeting the social/emotional and physical needs of her students, preparation of the classroom environment, understanding her content area, providing for students of varying ability through use of a variety of activities, exhibiting good judgement, communicating effectively with others and evaluating student's progress throughout the year. As department head, she is responsible for leading her department and setting a strong example of highly effective instruction for those she leads. Currently, Mr. Harris works with our sixth grade students at OPE.</p>
<p>Walker, Karen</p>	<p>Instructional Media</p>	<p>Mrs. Walker is responsible for establishing a classroom climate conducive to learning, demonstrating an interest in and willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom environment, meeting the social/emotional and physical needs of her students, preparation of the classroom environment, understanding her content area, providing for students of varying ability through use of a variety of activities, exhibiting good judgement, communicating effectively with others and evaluating student's progress throughout the year. As department head, she is responsible for leading her department and setting a strong example of highly effective instruction for those she leads. Currently, Mrs. Walker works with all students at OPE.</p>
<p>Tucker, Laurie</p>	<p>School Counselor</p>	<p>Mrs. Tucker is responsible for establishing a classroom climate conducive to learning, demonstrating an interest in and willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom environment, meeting the social/emotional and physical needs of her students, preparation of the classroom environment, understanding her content area, providing for students of varying ability through use of a variety of activities, exhibiting good judgement, communicating effectively with others and evaluating student's progress throughout the year. As department head, she is responsible for</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		leading her department and setting a strong example of highly effective instruction for those she leads. Currently, Mrs. Tucker works with our all students at OPE.
Herndon, Suzanne	Assistant Principal	Dr. Herndon serves OPE as the assistant principal and often works in the same capacity as the principal. She currently supervises the primary grade levels, works with and monitors the MTSS process, oversees all that involves ESE, and other administrative duties assigned.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders including parents and businesses that surround our school community are an integral piece to our success. As such, we have and will continue to engage those partners throughout the process. The SAC committee is comprised of a parent, teacher, support employee, principal and business partner. Parents will be receive a survey soliciting involvement and, once all voluntary applications are submitted, parents of OPE will vote on who will represent the parent chair on our SAC committee. Same process is employed for both the support and instructional positions.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

All goals developed will be connected to our assessment data and be driven by the progress monitoring that occurs quarterly at OPE. There will be intentionality regarding implementation and revision both with our SAC committee and the teachers on our campus. We believe these goals will drive the work we do each day. Those who have the biggest gap with respect to achievement will of course be a primary focus both in Tier 1 with formative assessment and in tier2/tier3. Additionally, because OPE has been widely successful, we are also working to improve our capacity in how we extend those students who have already proven proficiency.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%

Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	4	5	4	5	4	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	1	2	6	0	0	14
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	9	12	3	6	2	4	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	6

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	9	12	3	6	2	4	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	6

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79			87			91		
ELA Learning Gains	56			92			75		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44			86			76		
Math Achievement*	87			87			97		
Math Learning Gains	81			82			85		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68			90			98		
Science Achievement*	84			94			100		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	78			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	70			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	79	56	44	87	81	68	84					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
SWD	52	28	19	71	52	41						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	60	36		73	82							
HSP	81	66		83	83							
MUL	80	58		73	75							
PAC												
WHT	79	54	53	90	80	71	86					
FRL	74	58		81	71	54	80					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	87	92	86	87	82	90	94					
SWD	63	64		69	73							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	69			62								
HSP	89	86		89	81		85					
MUL	78			67								
PAC												
WHT	89	93	89	90	82	94	98					
FRL	80	86		80	90		90					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	91	75	76	97	85	98	100					
SWD	69	70	58	86	85	91						
ELL												
AMI												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
ASN	100			100								
BLK	83	77		95	85							
HSP	85	74		97	79							
MUL	94	71		94	100							
PAC												
WHT	92	74	75	97	83	100	100					
FRL	84	69	70	95	85	95	100					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Based on the 2022 data within this plan, OPE decreased in each demographic subgroup with respect to ELA and Math proficiency. SWD that year, particularly in learning gains, decreased at a higher rate than other subgroups and saw the biggest decrease in math proficiency overall. ELA, based on historical data, presents itself as the biggest area of opportunity regardless of subgroup with the same trend found in learning gains overall.

Though we did not have "learning gains" this year, based on proficiency, our SWD continue to be those who present the biggest need. While we did see growth across all 3 assessments, proficiency was the challenge in that subgroup.

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

Math proficiency in 5th grade dropped 13% for the 2023 school year (not provided here). That same cohort of students performed at 81% proficient the year prior and were not tested in third grade due to COVID. Arguably, the 5th grade teacher in our math position is exceptional both now and historically; however, this was the year standards were revised and a new curriculum was introduced in Eureka. Additionally, this same cohort of students performed lower in ELA than any other in quite some time at

OPE. Though they increased proficiency from 66% to 74% in ELA from 4th to 5th, it could be argued that their struggle in ELA also contributed to their struggle in math.

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.

OPE, in every category on PM3 performed well above state averages for proficiency in 2022-2023.

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

Given our SIP last year focused on 5th and 6th grade ELA (based on 4th and 5th grade scores the year prior), we saw a 12% from the 5th grade cohort in 6th grade (74% to 86%) and an 8% gain from the 4th grade cohort in 5th grade (66% to 74%). Additionally, our 5th grade science teacher's proficiency jumped from 82% to 92% in 2023 even though they're a different group of students. Every grade level tested in 2023 saw gains in their overall proficiency. Our work focused on improving instructional/professional practice through PLCs and an overall focus on school culture through PBIS and other school-wide initiatives. But the work our teachers have done over the 21 years as an "A" school should be recognized. They are dedicated and consistently work to improve the overall academic experience of their students. Lastly, those in the primary grades deserve some recognition as well. Their professional capacity is beyond reproach and they work extremely hard to develop our students so that they're ready, willing, and able to meet the expectations when they get to third grade.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Last year, we saw an increase in overall challenges with behavior that required immediate intervention. As such, we have worked within our PLC and PBIS teams to develop a plan to address those behaviors proactively through our P.R.I.D.E. initiative, school-wide expectation lessons given each week, and an extension to parents and our community in the same light. This work is ongoing and evolving each week. It should be noted that much of the work we've done with PBIS and PLCs has been derived from staff and student climate surveys.

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

Though we saw an increase in every category on PM and each grade level is performing well above state averages, the proficiency rates in two cohort groups (current 5th and 6th grade students) have been lower over the last two years. Additionally, because we are higher performing in many areas, extending our students when they master standards has been a primary focus. In this way, we will raise expectations for all, meet higher performing students where they are, and provide interventions and supports for those who need it when they do.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As previously stated, ELA in specific cohorts continues to be a focus for teachers and staff. We saw an increase from the 2022 to 2023 school year in those groups identified in the 2023 School Improvement Plan but the increase did not meet the level of success traditionally experienced at OPE. As such, we will continue our focus on those two groups (current 5th and 6th grade students) in ELA. Unfortunately, we do not have data in the way of traditional learning gains and so the intensity will be dedicated to overall proficiency for this year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of 5th grade and 6th grade students with respect to proficiency will increase from 74% to 79% (5th graders) and 75% to 80% (6th graders) by the end of the 2023-2024 school year as measured by the F.A.S.T. Assessment tool.

Monitoring:

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

ELA progress will be monitored through F.A.S.T. assessment data and include monitoring through the Lexia Core 5 program used throughout the year. Analysis will be ongoing for Lexia and occur after each PM assessment through PLCs (already scheduled)/ELA collaboratives at the county level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tyler Wood (tyler.wood@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Data analysis will occur at defined points in time and, in those discussions, a plan rooted in that data analysis will be developed to identify interventions necessary to improve the academic performance at the individual or group level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data taken from the PM and Lexia platform will be used to ensure all interventions are specifically addressing the individual needs of students. That data, coupled with an intense focus and frame regarding the standards at those grade levels, will ultimately be used to drive the work regarding interventions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PLCs will continue to be used as the platform to analyze and discuss data pertinent to the overall proficiency performance of students school-wide but, specifically those two grade levels listed above.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Herndon (suzanne.herndon@myoneclay.net)

By When: Agendas have been developed for those PLCs dedicated to data analysis. Two PLCs have been designated for this work for PM 1 (September 13th and 20th).

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

OPE is in year two with respect to the revised work related to PLCs. During the OneClay Leadership Academy (OLA), a plan was developed alongside teachers pertaining to the focus of work related to PLCs. Teachers worked diligently the year prior in PLCs, focusing on their own professional practice and, in turn, the success of their students. In the summer of 2023, our discussion led us to pay special attention to three areas for improvement. They include PLC time dedicated to identifying essential standards, creating common assessments, and extending students. Time at various points in the PLC process has been built in to focus on these initiatives. County goals and expectations are still very much apart of the PD structure but those are found in our "Core Learning" program now found in the Eagle News Newsletters that teachers receive each week.

Measurable Outcome:

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

90% of teachers will participate in all (37 total) preplanned PLCs together to increase student proficiency in all grade levels and content areas with a paramount focus on those in our 5th and 6th grade groups dedicated to improving their respective proficiency scores from 74% to 79% (5th grade) and 75% to 80% (6th grade) by the end of the 2022-2023 school year as measured by the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

PLCs each week vary with their implementation model. Some are whole group while some are conducted in person by grade level. Attendance will be tracked by Dr. Herndon through use of the PLC agendas embedded in the PLC plan that was developed and shared with all prior to the start of the school year. That document (PLC plan) outlines each PLC date, it's purpose/focus, and includes the agenda which will be used to track the attendance. Additionally, all instructional employees outside the traditional classroom setting including resource, ESE teachers, and the school counselor have been strategically placed to provide support for those PLC groups at the center of our work (e.g. 3rd, 5th and 6th grade).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Herndon (suzanne.herndon@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We have continued to reinforce the work defined by our district office and have explicitly taught and discussed those goals in PLCs and the "Core Learning" application found in the Eagle News Newsletter each week. Additional to that work are those areas discussed during OLA to include identifying essential standards, creating common assessments, work in disaggregating that data (and F.A.S.T.), and PBIS. The same evidence-based strategies will be employed in this Area of Focus as we continue to make clear the focus for our learning each week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PLC plan was developed and discussed in cooperation with the OLA leaders and grade level department chairs. The Clay Vision for instruction continues to be a framework and foundation for the work but extending and improving the professional capacity of OPE's teachers has become more profound when you consider the success they've historically experienced. Data analysis with respect to

F.A.S.T. will be ongoing but, more importantly, that same process regarding common assessments related to the essential standards identified will be wildly important in our PLC groups.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PLCs continue to thrive at the grade level; however, there is some ongoing work vertically in the upper grades given the size of our school. We're working to balance the work of those in self-contained classrooms with those who are teaching specific content. Our 5th and 6th grade teachers are on a proverbial island because they are departmentalized. We have begun work in identifying standards related to or identical across those two grade level groups and will continue to provide opportunities for teachers to work with each other.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Herndon (suzanne.herndon@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will check progress in 6-8 week intervals and have established the last quarter of PLCs as "open" should we need to shift points of focus as we make our way through the process.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Historically, math instruction and performance has been strong at OPE and, though we saw a large decrease in 5th grade math in 2023, it continues to be even now. Important here is the conversation shifting to the cohort of students rather than the fifth grade teacher. There is no pattern evident to suggest concern but with new curriculum and standards for year two, we want to continue to provide wrap around support for all grade levels implementing the Eureka Curriculum and new standards. With our work in the way of identifying and addressing those gap standards, we saw success in all grade levels. We will continue that strategy this year as well. Though the goal here is school-wide, it should be noted that special attention will be paid to that sixth grade cohort.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of teachers (K-5) will continue to implement the Eureka curriculum with fidelity so that, at minimum, 80% of students in grades 3 - 6 are proficient by the end of the 2022-2023 school year as measured by the F.A.S.T. assessment tool.

Monitoring:

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

Use of county specialists and district led county collaboratives continue to be the primary vessel for teacher capacity. Over the summer, and during District In-Service, most of our K-5 teachers were trained in Eureka Squared. The similarity between that which we used last year (Eureka) and the newly adopted Eureka Squared program provides some comfort for those who began the process with it last year. Additionally, PLCs will also serve as an opportunity for teachers to discuss, plan, and disaggregate data centered around the program so that the appropriate interventions are provided to those in need. Lastly, extending students in math, especially those who have mastered the standards, will be a part of this process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Formative assessments, particularly those developed around the chosen essential standards, will play a major role. Many of the "Checks" are embedded in the curriculum. We will continue to ensure data analyzed across the given grade level is used to diagnose and provide appropriate interventions to those students who indicate a need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This work is a continual focus from district and school-based leadership. Given our time spent with respect to PLCs and the OLA, tying this goal to our work with essential standards and common assessment is an obvious next step.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Classroom visits from administrators and county specialists will be paramount in monitoring the goal as feedback focused on the ongoing efforts will help prepare teachers to make the most beneficial decisions. Additionally, administrator participation in grade level PLCs will also play a role and the opportunities for discussion/collaboration should provide the support needed for success.

Person Responsible: Tyler Wood (tyler.wood@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly, quarterly, and yearly.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

There continues to be a slight disconnect between staff and students when looking at our school climate and culture survey. The biggest gap exists between our students understanding of expectations in the way of classroom management, positive recognition from adults, and in those who "like coming to school everyday". As such, the PBIS committee and administration have developed a comprehensive plan to address the divide in all three areas. First, every teacher with a homeroom class was given a classroom management plan to "fill out" with their respective students. The plan itself addresses a myriad of things including the creation of classroom rules aligned with our Eagle P.R.I.D.E. school-wide expectations, setting rituals and routines, and a discussion about how students would like to be recognized positively. Though we have included positive recognition in the classroom management plan, our PBIS committee is also working toward a school-wide recognition program outside the typical award ceremonies. Last, and maybe the most important, is creating an environment in which our students want to come to and learn in each day. This is where our PBIS team has worked to develop school-wide lessons centered around P.R.I.D.E. and what it means to be an Eagle.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of teachers will develop their classroom management plan alongside students, develop a class structure to recognize students, and implement Eagle P.R.I.D.E. lessons centered around our school-wide expectations for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The classroom management plans will be uploaded to a shared drive and "revisited" each quarter to include student input regarding changes if necessary. The PBIS team will also meet each month to develop school-wide lessons and work toward full school-wide positive recognition for adults and students. Finally, we will monitor our work through the PBIS BOQs and, since we qualify now, move toward recognition as a model school for PBIS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Creating a collaborative environment focused on those three "disconnects" found in our survey results will reinforce several things moving forward. It will create a deeper opportunity for students to have voice, buy-in, and explicitly communicate that their input matters when developing this plan. Recognizing students (and staff) positively will play a part in creating an environment in which students want to come to, and ultimately reduce unwanted behaviors common at OPE.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The largest gap seen in our survey results was whether or not students like to come to school. Addressing this from multiple angles and discussing the proverbial elephant with those who responded will afford us a better opportunity to address the misconceptions, preconceptions, or the minor disconnect some students have with coming to school each day.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PBIS training was completed last year and, by and large, the staff was informally trained. Over the summer, 13+ teachers joined us in the Media Center to develop school-wide lessons centered around P.R.I.D.E. and, over the course of the first few weeks, began working toward classroom management plan completion. We will continue to develop lessons, engage our students in conversation about the importance of school, and implement the school-wide positive recognition program at OPE.

Person Responsible: Tyler Wood (tyler.wood@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Orange Park High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Orange Park High School

2300 KINGSLEY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://oph.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Welcome to Orange Park High School where our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is innovative, engaging, and empowering for all students. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure an educational environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these ideals, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and acquiring applicable life skills is the purpose for the Clay County School District. To support the District's purpose, Orange Park High School serves all students with diligence to provide the academic, workforce and life skills needed for success. Providing a safe working and learning environment is a priority and a key to the success of OPHS. Continual professional development for teachers, support staff, and administrators provides assurance that the students of Orange Park High School will get the best education possible.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gunder, Ivin	Principal	<p>Responsibilities and duties of this position include: Ensure compliance with established rules and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing, and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and ensure proper security, maintenance, and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/ reports and the precise information entered into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging instructional support and administrative staff development, including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, a school budget, and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures, including interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff, and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment, and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district-wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be accountable for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the performance of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Standards Assessments, End-of-Course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students, and the community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals, or others preparing for School Principal certification. Provide leadership for all stakeholders in developing school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boyer, Bryan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal/vice is directly responsible to the school principal. They serve in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any responsibilities outlined in the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Boysen, Paul	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal/vice is directly responsible to the school principal. They serve in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any responsibilities outlined in the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Hayes, Caitlyn	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal/vice is directly responsible to the school principal. They serve in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any responsibilities outlined in the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Mayberry, Laura	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal/vice is directly responsible to the school principal. They serve in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any responsibilities outlined in the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
James, Rebecca	Dean	The Dean of School Culture is directly responsible to the school principal. He/ She will serve in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. The primary function is to bridge the student-faculty relationship through research-based techniques and strategies. The Dean of School Culture will act as the proxy for the school principal in disciplinary matters.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our school meets with our School Advisory Committee. As a team, with stakeholder input, our school improvement plan was presented, discussed and approved. Our committee consists of instructional and support employees, parents, students, and community members.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our school improvement plan will be monitored by administration. Weekly meetings are held by our team to discuss student progress and teacher support and development. We will continually analyze State assessment data quarterly to monitor student progress and address ways in which we will revise the plan if needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	60%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48			48			50		
ELA Learning Gains	49			48			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36			47			36		
Math Achievement*	39			30			41		
Math Learning Gains	56			28			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51			31			34		
Science Achievement*	59			60			63		
Social Studies Achievement*	74			74			73		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	95			96			91		
College and Career Acceleration	61			49			59		
ELP Progress	28			52			46		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	596
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	95

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	2	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	48			
HSP	53			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	49	36	39	56	51	59	74		95	61	28
SWD	19	29	21	20	41	42	34	49		93	36	
ELL	26	44	39	31	61	56	21	35		100	44	28
AMI												
ASN	90	70						70				
BLK	34	39	34	30	52	53	49	71		96	48	25
HSP	52	55	52	35	53	40	59	65		94	48	27
MUL	38	43	25	33	52		56	71		93	76	
PAC												
WHT	52	51	31	48	60	62	61	82		96	67	
FRL	42	46	33	30	50	52	56	69		95	58	36

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	48	47	30	28	31	60	74		96	49	52
SWD	16	36	43	14	20	15	24	41		95	25	
ELL	13	47	46	14	29	39	25	25		100	20	52
AMI												
ASN	56	61		42	45		75	93		100	77	
BLK	35	46	45	18	26	30	48	61		98	32	38
HSP	47	47	38	29	25	25	58	64		97	52	60
MUL	36	47	53	20	27	30	53	95		100	53	
PAC												
WHT	57	50	51	39	30	34	71	82		95	53	
FRL	44	44	45	21	22	29	52	72		95	41	60

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	50	46	36	41	43	34	63	73		91	59	46
SWD	19	30	27	8	20	31	32	57		85	44	
ELL	9	38	42	21	31	30	41	53		75		46
AMI												
ASN	58	50		80	57		91					
BLK	35	43	38	30	32	27	43	60		91	45	
HSP	41	40	27	32	45	26	59	69		91	62	48
MUL	60	46		41	42	33	91	82		94	47	
PAC												
WHT	58	49	37	50	48	46	69	79		90	64	33
FRL	41	43	34	32	39	32	53	68		88	54	48

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 areas are in Math and ELA. We found that only 52% of students scored level 3 proficiency or higher on the Algebra I EOC and only 34% of students scored level 3 proficiency or higher on the Geometry EOC. 9th grade ELA remained the same as 2021-22 with only 47% of students scoring level 3 proficiency or higher and 10th grade ELA at 47% as well.

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

The data component that shows the greatest decline was in Geometry, students scoring a level 3 or higher proficiency dropped from 40% in 2021-22 to 34% for the 2022-23 school year. One of the areas that impacted is teacher turnover. We had a number of long term substitutes for more than half of the school year. 28% of our SWD are scoring a level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC.

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.

The greatest gap in comparison to the State averages is in Geometry. Impacts include teacher turnover, specifically in our SWD inclusion classes. We had a number of long term substitutes for more than half of the school year.

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

We did increase proficiency in Biology scores gaining 7 percentage points of students of students who scored a level 3 or higher proficiency going from 57% to 64%. Teachers worked in a more collaborate professional learning community where they examined student data and created common assessments that were directly aligned to the power Biology standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is our SWD and attendance. 27% of our SWD are chronically absent.

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

1. Increase Math proficiency in core EOC courses
2. Increase ELA proficiency in both 9th and 10th grade
3. Strengthen tier 1 instruction for our SWD
4. Increase student attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on F.A.S.T data, our area of focus will be ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall ELA proficiency from 47.39% to 55.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use data from our Performance Matters Baseline, PM2, and our end of the year PM3. As well as student individual grades and data chats that they will have with their teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Individual & Small Group Instruction
Additional academic programs offered outside of school hours

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide focused, intensive small-group interventions for English learners determined at risk for reading problems. Although the amount of time in small-group instruction and the intensity of this instruction should reflect the degree of risk, determined by reading assessment data and other indicators, the interventions should include the five core reading elements (phonological awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension). Explicit, direct instruction should be the primary means of instructional delivery.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All ELA teachers will receive direct support through professional development in small group instruction

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will participate in collaborative lesson planning with Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will utilize and analyze data to monitor progress and create targeted small groups.

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will conduct data meetings to address struggling standards/skills after F.A.S.T data.

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Instructional coach will focus on improving instructional planning, delivery, data analysis, and student outcomes through targeted teacher supports

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Using PM F.A.S.T. data, target lower quartile students through after school tutoring, boot camps and Saturday School opportunities. Transportation will be provided to students.

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly throughout 23-24 school year.

Using PM F.A.S.T. data, target lower quartile students through after school tutoring, boot camps and Saturday School opportunities. Transportation will be provided to students.

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly throughout 23-24 school year.

Support student achievement through parent conferences to discuss data and collaborate to create solutions for student success

Person Responsible: Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly throughout 23-24 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on EOC data, our area of focus will be Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency from 39.00% to 45.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be conducted through Synergy, Progress Monitoring testing -B.E.S.T. Testing at each progress monitoring cycle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ivin Gunder (ivin.gunder@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Provide focused, intensive small-group interventions for English learners determined to be at risk for reading problems that effect their Math skills and subject area vocabulary.
Provide Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Provide explicit and systematic intervention instruction to struggling students should receive explicit instruction to ensure that they have the foundational skills and conceptual knowledge necessary for understanding grade level content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All Math teachers will receive direct support through professional development in small group instruction

Person Responsible: Laura Mayberry (laura.mayberry@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will participate in collaborative lesson planning with Professional Learning Communities

Person Responsible: Laura Mayberry (laura.mayberry@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will utilize and analyze data to monitor progress and create targeted small groups to close learning gaps.

Person Responsible: Laura Mayberry (laura.mayberry@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will conduct data meetings to address struggling standards/skills after Quarterly PM Synergy testing

Person Responsible: Laura Mayberry (laura.mayberry@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Using PM Synergy data, target lower quartile students through after school tutoring, boot camps and Saturday School opportunities

Person Responsible: Laura Mayberry (laura.mayberry@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Support student achievement through parent conferences to discuss data and collaborate to create solutions for student success

Person Responsible: Laura Mayberry (laura.mayberry@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on Synergy data, our area of focus will be Attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will decrease the number of students with five or more absences from 75.00% to 65.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Grad Tracker, Synergy

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryan Boyer (bryan.boyer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Establish Positive Connections (PBIS)
Foster Student Expectation of Success (POV)
Schools and Families Have Meaningful Two-Way Communication (PFE)
Active Classroom (High Student Engagement) (POV)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Creating highly engaging classrooms will foster student learning and achievement. Students will be engaged in learning with a technologically rich classroom. Fostering strong communication with families so that we can best support students academic achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Weekly highlight of our Rising Raiders through PBIS. Promote and share via social media pages.

Person Responsible: Caitlyn Hayes (caitlyn.hayes@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Share District wide Attendance policies with families frequently through email and letters home
All teachers will enforce the policy following the 3 day- 5 day- 10 day protocol.
Students identified with attendance concerns will be added to our Success Team Meetings.

Person Responsible: Caitlyn Hayes (caitlyn.hayes@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Continued work with PBIS team promoting school wide expectations.

Person Responsible: Paul Boysen (paul.boysen@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

Establish two way communication via Synergy, Weekly Robo Calls, and Weekly Newsletters from the Principal.

Quarterly SAC Committee newsletter to share campus wide updates and school events.

Person Responsible: Caitlyn Hayes (caitlyn.hayes@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly/Quarterly

Teachers will create an engaging classroom with the use of updated technology.

Person Responsible: Caitlyn Hayes (caitlyn.hayes@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of the 2023-2024 school year.

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities overall proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase our overall proficiency from 38% to 41% for our SWD.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through support facilitators and their SDI logs and data trackers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caitlyn Hayes (caitlyn.hayes@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strategic Planning in conjunction with the Florida Inclusion Network
 Moving toward a support facilitation model of instruction
 Individual & Small Group Instruction
 Provide Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Support Facilitation Model provides supports and services based on an individual student's need, and are reflected in their Individual Education Plan (IEP). The support facilitator may work with small groups of students within general education classrooms or at times in the ESE classroom. Both the support facilitator and general education teachers work with heterogeneous and flexible groups of students and are viewed as equal partners in the classroom. Support facilitation provides for collaborative planning, modeling, and coaching of effective strategies and implementation of accommodations to promote progress related to student's IEP goals. Within the model, the level, frequency, and intensity of services varies based on student need and may include academic independent functioning, behavioral and social/emotional support. The ESE support facilitator works in conjunction with school administrators, general education teachers, related service providers, and other support personnel to communicate and address the unique needs of students with disabilities.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monitor SWD via Support Facilitators, ESE Department Head, and general education teacher.

Person Responsible: Caitlyn Hayes (caitlyn.hayes@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly/Monthly through the end of the 2024 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Title I resources will be allocated to a variety of areas. First, will be in professional development to build the capacity of our teachers and strengthen instructional methods. We will be hiring a ELA/Reading curriculum coach to support teachers through their instruction, planning, and practices, as well as supporting student achievement. We will create technology rich classrooms to promote high engagement and increase student attendance. Lastly, we will be facilitating parent and family engagement evenings focused on academic achievement of our students.

Clay County Schools

Orange Park Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	29
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Orange Park Junior High School

1500 GANO AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://opj.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission and primary purpose of Orange Park Junior High School, along with parents and community members, is to make student learning our chief priority in a safe and physically comfortable environment where students are valued individuals with unique physical, social, emotional and intellectual needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that teachers, parents, and the community share the responsibility for the support of the school's mission. We believe that all students can learn. We believe that students learn in different ways. We believe a student's self-esteem is enhanced by positive relationships. We believe students learn best when they are actively in the learning process.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Auguste, Tania	Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and ensure proper security, maintenance, and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district-wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Standards Assessments, End-of-Course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students, and community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.
Martin, Aleatha	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach will focus primarily on the ELA/Reading Department to improve instructional planning, delivery, data analysis, and student outcomes. Research has shown that the top four factors that impact student achievement are: classroom management, teaching for learning, home and parent involvement, and believing that all students can learn (Hattie, 2010). The instructional coaches' work will strengthen each of these factors and is expected to translate into increase academic success.
Allison, Arthur	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal/vice is directly responsible to the school principal. He/she serves in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any duties outlined on the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Moore, Stan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal/vice is directly responsible to the school principal. He/she serves in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any duties outlined on the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Smith, Ansley	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal/vice is directly responsible to the school principal. He/she serves in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any duties outlined on the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Ravenell, Shalonda	Dean	The Dean of Discipline and School Culture will bridge the student-faculty relationship through research-based techniques and strategies. The Dean will also assist leadership in the development and implementation of strategies designed to promote a positive learning environment. In addition, The Dean will foster positive public relations, effective conferencing and communication with parents, students, and teachers.
Shaw, Hilary	School Counselor	Plan and develop the school counseling program of the school. Provide the opportunity for individual and group counseling to all students. Provide leadership and consultation in the school's program of pupil appraisal. Provide assistance to students and parents in educational and occupational planning for the student. Coordinate and initiate referrals of students to other specialists in student services and to public and private agencies in the community. May serve as a consultant for ESE screenings, staffing, and follow-up procedures. Provide placement services to students by assisting

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

them in making appropriate choices of school subjects/courses of study, and in making transitions from one school level to another, one school to another, and from school to employment. Consult with parents and act as a resource person on the growth and development of their children. Work closely with members of the administrative/teaching staff to the end that all school resources are directed toward meeting individual students' needs. Assist in disseminating research findings to school staff members. Interpret counseling and guidance services of the school to school staff members, parents, and community. May plan with Occupational Specialists to implement their program. (Secondary Only) Perform other such duties as requested by the Principal. Twelve (12) Month counselors may be responsible for supervising the school counseling department and implementing the guidance program.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for involving all stakeholders in regard to the School Improvement Plan, Orange Park Junior High hosts a School Advisory Council meeting inviting community members, parents/guardians, and teachers to the school to discuss the contents of the Title I Plan that would then be added to the School Improvement Plan. OPJ allows for open dialogue that allows for questions, comments, and concerns to be addressed and change (if needed) the School Improvement Plan. OPJ also has a leadership team that will meet and discuss the components of the School Improvement Plan, as well as items made through the School Advisory Council, and adjust as needed. Once all stakeholders has been heard, the School Improvement Plan is finalized.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

During the school's monthly whole group PLC's, they will share the school progress and challenges and discuss ways to improve in the classroom. The administrators will do learning walks weekly to give the teacher's feedback on ways to improve and praise their great strides.

Teacher's will do a pre and post test on materials learned.

Teacher's are responsible for knowing what level their students are on and keeping up quarterly with their progress.

The School Improvement plan will be updated quarterly during SAC meetings and discussed monthly during PBIS meetings to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	64%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	134	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	120	253
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	44
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	8	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	11	123
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	9	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	11	123
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	152	286

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days									229	229	458
One or more suspensions									0	110	110
Course failure in ELA									0	26	26
Course failure in Math									0	12	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment									0	85	85
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment									0	80	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.									0	6	6

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319	319

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229	229	458
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	110
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	85
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319	319

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48			47			57		
ELA Learning Gains	43			46			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32			35			33		
Math Achievement*	47			40			56		
Math Learning Gains	43			27			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39			30			46		
Science Achievement*	45			50			60		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*	66			68			76		
Middle School Acceleration	55			50			78		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	40			33			40		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	35	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	66			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	43	32	47	43	39	45	66	55			40
SWD	26	35	35	30	37	30	26	34	33			
ELL	30	37	32	36	51	36	8	45				40
AMI												
ASN	88	69		63	56				55			
BLK	33	40	30	36	39	34	28	59	58			
HSP	47	37	26	45	43	39	44	63	50			
MUL	48	47	60	48	39	30	48	75				
PAC												
WHT	58	45	32	57	45	50	55	73	54			
FRL	40	39	32	43	40	38	41	63	53			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	46	35	40	27	30	50	68	50			33
SWD	24	28	22	28	33	37	31	47	21			
ELL	32	43	43	27	39	56	27	69	40			33

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	75	67		56	40		82		47			
BLK	37	43	29	27	23	26	29	56	46			
HSP	46	54	48	41	26	30	50	65	52			50
MUL	44	41	27	38	18	25	53	70	57			
PAC												
WHT	52	45	35	48	30	38	61	78	49			
FRL	40	42	35	37	29	30	43	65	44			

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	57	51	33	56	50	46	60	76	78			40
SWD	30	40	34	30	49	46	27	58				
ELL	22	44	35	23	41	38	17	41				40
AMI												
ASN	81	65		81	65		85	92	88			
BLK	41	41	29	38	46	42	41	60	73			
HSP	57	55	38	56	47	40	54	78	77			
MUL	53	46	29	53	57	53	51	72	80			
PAC												
WHT	66	56	37	65	50	51	75	82	78			
FRL	47	44	32	45	47	41	45	69	72			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to OPJ's F.A.S.T data, ELA/Reading performed the lowest with a decline of only 7% from the 21-22 to 22-23 school year. Contributing factors in the ELA/Reading that lead to the decline of proficiency from the 21-22 to the 22-23 school year includes teacher turnover and having long term substitutes in ELA/Reading classes. 60% of the 7th and 8th grade students scored a Level 1 on the ELA FSA in the Spring of 2022. Therefore, 60% of students were starting the 22-23 school year 1 or 2 grade levels behind. This and long term substitutes contributed to the decline of 7% on the Spring F.A.S.T assessment in 22-23.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year would be ELA/Reading. In the 21-22 school year, ELA/Reading were 48% proficient. In the 22-23 school year, ELA/Reading declined to 41% proficient. Based on the 22-23 school year data from the F.A.S.T assessment, the factors that contributed to this decline were students coming into the school year 1 or 2 grade levels behind, therefore, teachers had to focus on closing gaps while also focusing on grade level content. Long term substitutes taking place of classrooms teachers contributed to the decline. With the teacher shortage, qualified teachers were not available to assist with learning in the ELA/Reading classrooms.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average would be ELA/Reading. The state had an average of 47% proficient in the 22-23 school year. ELA/Reading were 41% proficient. This is a gap of 6% from the state average. Factors that may have contributed to this gap include but are not limited to the small percentage of schools that identify as a Title I school, such as Orange Park Junior High, compared to partnering schools that are more affluent. Students at Title I schools have shown to fall below the average threshold meaning that students are 1 to 2 grade levels behind. This knowledge gap possess difficulty for teachers due to having to focus on activating little to no background knowledge in specific subject matters then focusing on targeting grade level standards.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement would be Mathematics. In the 21-22 school year, Mathematics were 47% proficient. In the 22-23 school year, Mathematics were 57% proficient. That is a 10% growth in student proficiency. In the area of Mathematics, the teachers focused on the use of small group instruction to target the Lower Quartile Students and standards from data during the data discussion in the 4th quarter of the 22-23 school year. The Mathematics teachers assisted students during tutoring hours to further help close their academic gap in Mathematics.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data, the potential areas of concern would be One or More Suspensions (which correlates with Absent 10% or more days) and Level 1 on statewide ELA Assessment. These two indicators are areas of concern due to ELA/Reading being a focus for growth for the 23-24 school year. With students either being suspended or absent 10% or more days possess a concern to their learning in ELA/Reading classes. When students are absent (due to illness or suspension), important and critical

instructional time is being lost. Therefore, leading to students not learning grade level material and in return, receiving Level 1 on statewide ELA assessments.

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

School Improvement for the upcoming school year will focus on the following with a rank of 1 to 3, with 1 being highest priority. 1: ELA/Reading with a focus on Morphology, 2: Positive Behavior Systems of Support (PBIS) with a focus on Discipline, and 3: Mathematics with a focus on Data Analysis.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to our school data review for the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. data, ELA was 41% proficient which was a 1% decline from the 2021-2022 FSA data. When analyzing the data, OPJH noticed that the greatest area for improvement was in Morphology which will support Vocabulary and Reading Across Genres.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on F.A.S.T. data, OPJH has an opportunity for growth in ELA/Reading, specifically Morphology. By using the strategies and actions described below, OPJH will increase overall proficiency in Morphology (ELA/Reading) from 40% proficient to 42% proficient by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through formative assessments analyzed in ELA/Reading data meetings, addressed and targeted plans during Professional Learning Communities, and Administrative walkthroughs with immediate feedback that include strengths and needs for improvement. Data sources that will be used to analyze student performance include SRA assessments (corrective reading), F.A.S.T. Benchmark Assessments (three times a year), and working closely with administration at quarterly data meetings to analyze data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To improve proficiency in ELA/Reading, OPJH will focus on the following evidence-based interventions:

- small group instruction
- direct-explicit instruction
- explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

OPJH will utilize Small Group Instruction to target the Lower Quartile students and standards that students have not mastered. Direct-Explicit Instruction will be the main focus in all of the ELA/Reading classrooms to allow for students to receive lessons that focus specifically on the B.E.S.T. standards. OPJH will also focus on Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction through the Reading classes to support intensive reading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Increase Small Group instruction targeting strategies and skills related to Morphology. Provide Professional Development on Small Group Instruction. Use data to monitor progress and adjust small groups. Use engaging supplemental materials to support growth in Morphology.

Person Responsible: Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 School Year

Teachers will focus on modeling and explicitly teaching how to break apart unknown words to assist with the teaching of Morphology. During Professional Learning Communities, teachers will address vocabulary (morphology) and identify research-based strategies to support their teaching.

Person Responsible: Jasmine Gordon (jasmine.gordon@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 School Year

Conduct quarterly data meetings to discuss F.A.S.T. data to identify progress or decline of the targeted skill/standard (Morphology). Focus on the Lower Quartile students in regard to intensive support and enrichment in regard to the high performing students.

Person Responsible: Aleatha Martin (aleatha.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 School Year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Using Synergy data from the 22-23 school year, Orange Park Junior High identified where the highest need in Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support resided. There were 912 incident reports submitted for 7th grade students and 1,021 incident reports submitted for 8th grade. With a high number of incident reports, this has been determined as a crucial need to reduce through Positive Behavioral Incidents and Supports.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Area of focus will be to use the strategies and action plan for 2023-2024 to decrease discipline referrals from 675 to 330.

Monitoring:

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

PBIS: Discipline Referrals will be monitored through Synergy Discipline Reports. These reports will be created quarterly to identify where the school currently is with the number of referrals being processed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shalonda Ravenell (shalonda.ravenell@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In order to obtain success in the decrease of discipline referrals through PBIS, Orange Park Junior High will use the following evidence-based interventions: foster positive relationships, define & teach positive expectations, and focus on the school and families having meaningful two-way communication.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to foster positive relationships, teachers will build classroom community through creating a safe and engaging learning environment, create positive relationships through respectful and positive communication with students and families. Define & teach positive expectations through modeling expected behavior to students, setting positive expectations at the beginning of the school year, and holding high expectations throughout the school year. Having meaningful two-way communication with families allow for families to address questions and concerns and receive a response in a timely manner, conduct parent/teacher conferences and provide families with data to support concerns, if any.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Work with teachers to gather knowledge of how to foster a positive learning environment while understanding their students emotional needs through a Professional Learning Community book study: "Flooded: A Brain-Based Guide to Help Students Regulate Their Emotions".

Person Responsible: Shalonda Ravenell (shalonda.ravenell@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year

Host Parent and Family Engagement events that focus on Social Emotional Learning (SEL) to assist families with understanding how their students mental state and physical surroundings affect their everyday learning and behavior.

Person Responsible: Shalonda Ravenell (shalonda.ravenell@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to our school data review for the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. data, Math was 51% proficient which was a 4% increase from the 2021-2022 FSA data. When analyzing the data, OPJH noticed that the greatest area for improvement was in Data Analysis in both 7th and 8th grade standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on F.A.S.T. data, OPJH has an opportunity for growth in Mathematics, specifically Data Analysis. By using the strategies and actions described below, OPJH will increase overall proficiency in Data Analysis from 51% proficient to 53% proficient by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through formative assessments analyzed in Mathematics data meetings, addressed and targeted plans during Professional Learning Communities, and Administrative walkthroughs with immediate feedback that include strengths and needs for improvement. Data sources that will be used to analyze student performance include ALEKS Benchmark assessments, F.A.S.T. Benchmark Assessments (three times a year), and working closely with administration at quarterly data meetings to analyze data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ansley Smith (ansley.smith@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To improve proficiency in Mathematics, OPJH will focus on the following evidence-based interventions:

- small group instruction
- teacher modeling
- immediate feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

OPJH will utilize Small Group Instruction to target the Lower Quartile students and standards that students have not mastered. Teacher Modeling will be the main focus in all of the Mathematic classrooms to allow for students to receive lessons that focus specifically on the math standards. OPJH will also focus on providing teachers and students with immediate feedback from classroom walkthroughs, anecdotal notes during lessons, data meetings with students, parent/teacher conferences.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Continue with Small Group instruction targeting strategies and skills related to Data Analysis. Provide Professional Development on Small Group Instruction. Use data to monitor progress and adjust small groups. Use engaging supplemental materials to support growth in Data Analysis.

Person Responsible: Ansley Smith (ansley.smith@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 School Year

Teachers will focus on modeling and explicitly teaching how to work through problems that focus on Data Analysis. During Professional Learning Communities, teachers will address and identify research-based strategies to support their teaching in Data Analysis.

Person Responsible: Marcia Chaney (marcia.chaney@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 School Year

Conduct quarterly data meetings to discuss F.A.S.T. data to identify progress or decline of the targeted skill/standard (Data Analysis). Focus on the Lower Quartile students in regard to intensive support and enrichment in regard to the high performing students.

Person Responsible: Aleatha Martin (aleatha.martin@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 School Year

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After analyzing data pertaining specifically to Students with Disabilities, Orange Park Junior High identified this subgroup as a crucial need. Subgroup SWD were at 32% proficient, where the threshold for proficiency is 41%. This percentage puts Subgroup SWD below the threshold by 9%, which has identified the group as a crucial need for support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Identifying Subgroup SWD for an opportunity of growth, Orange Park Junior High will focus on supporting these students by analyzing district and state assessments in Spring 2024, such as F.A.S.T. Assessments, to identify growth. By using strategies and action steps identified below, OPJ will work towards increasing Subgroup SWD from 32% proficient to 34% proficient by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Subgroup SWD will be monitored for the desired outcome through formative and summative assessments in data meetings (all core subjects--Math, Reading/ELA, Science, SS/Civics), discussed and focused on during Professional Learning Communities, and a focus for Administrative walkthroughs where administration have prior knowledge of identified students and keep them in their radar.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stan Moore (william.moore@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for Subgroup SWD include the evidence-based interventions identified for the instructional practices of ELA/Reading and Math while focusing on Subgroup SWD during small group instruction. Using cognitive strategy and direct-explicit instruction, interactive and engaging small groups, teaching self-regulation and self-monitoring, and collaborating with ESE specialists.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cognitive Strategy and Direct-Explicit Instruction will provide immediate feedback to Subgroup SWD on their progress and areas of improvement, identify their targeted skills/standards, teach based on their learning style, consistent modeling and practice.

Creating interactive and engaging small groups will provide students with a more targeted plan that will better support their learning. While setting goals and monitoring those goals for Subgroup SWD through data chats.

Teaching Self-regulation and Self-Monitoring will provide students with the opportunity to take ownership of their learning through data chats with teacher, track their progress and set goals.

Collaborating and Planning with ESE specialists will allow for Subgroup SWD to receive the appropriate and federally required requirements to support their learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Conduct data meetings to address struggling standards/skills pertaining to Subgroup SWD

Person Responsible: Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year

Collaborate during Professional Learning Communities with support from district specialists to common plan assessments and lessons to support Subgroup SWD

Person Responsible: Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After analyzing data pertaining specifically to our Black/African-American students, Orange Park Junior High identified this subgroup as a crucial need. Subgroup BLK/AA were at 40% proficient, where the threshold for proficiency is 41%. This percentage puts Subgroup BLK/AA below the threshold by 1%, which has identified the group as a need for support to move past the threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Identifying Subgroup BLK/AA for an opportunity of growth, Orange Park Junior High will focus on supporting these students by analyzing district and state assessments in Spring 2024, such as F.A.S.T. Assessments, to identify growth. By using strategies and action steps identified below, OPJ will work towards increasing Subgroup BLK/AA from 40% proficient to 42% proficient by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Subgroup BLK/AA will be monitored for the desired outcome through formative and summative assessments in data meetings (all core subjects--Math, Reading/ELA, Science, SS/Civics), discussed and focused on during Professional Learning Communities, and a focus for Administrative walkthroughs where administration have prior knowledge of identified students and keep them in their radar.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stan Moore (william.moore@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for Subgroup BLK/AA include the evidence-based interventions identified for the instructional practices of ELA/Reading and Math while focusing on Subgroup BLK/AA during small group instruction. Additionally, provide students with positive behavioral interventions and supports, promote alternative thinking strategies, and family and school partnership programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports to assist Subgroup BLK/AA with regulating their emotions and promote alternative thinking strategies will allow for the students to be able to communicate their needs and receive the necessary things they need to be successful.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Conduct data meetings to address struggling standards/skills pertaining to Subgroup BLK/AA

Person Responsible: Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout th 23-24 school year

Collaborate during Professional Learning Communities with support from district specialists to common plan assessments and lessons to support Subgroup BLK/AA

Person Responsible: Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After analyzing data pertaining specifically to English Language Learners(ELL), Orange Park Junior High identified this subgroup as a crucial need. Subgroup ELL were at 35% proficient, where the threshold for proficiency is 41%. This percentage puts Subgroup ELL below the threshold by 6%, which has identified the group as a crucial need for support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Identifying Subgroup ELL for an opportunity of growth, Orange Park Junior High will focus on supporting these students by analyzing district and state assessments in Spring 2024, such as F.A.S.T. Assessments, to identify growth. By using strategies and action steps identified below, OPJ will work towards increasing Subgroup ELL from 35% proficient to 37% proficient by the end of th 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Subgroup ELL will be monitored for the desired outcome through formative and summative assessments in data meetings (all core subjects--Math, Reading/ELA, Science, SS/Civics), discussed and focused on during Professional Learning Communities, and a focus for Administrative walkthroughs where administration have prior knowledge of identified students and keep them in their radar.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stan Moore (william.moore@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for Subgroup ELL include the evidence-based interventions identified for the instructional practices of ELA/Reading and Math while focusing on Subgroup ELL during small group instruction and in their ESOL class.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing the ESOL department to work with the students in their home language and continue to assist them towards understanding, working, and speaking with material in English. ESOL teachers focus on small group instruction to provide material in home language and convert to English to prepare for state assessments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Conduct data meetings to address struggling standards/skills pertaining to Subgroup ELL

Person Responsible: Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year

Collaborate during Professional Learning Communities with support from district specialists to common plan assessments and lessons to support Subgroup ELL

Person Responsible: Tania Auguste (tania.auguste@myoneclay.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

In order to identify the resources allocated based on needs and school improvement funding, Orange Park Junior High's Leadership Team, SAC members, and Title I closely analyze multiple sources of data to identify the highest need in the school. Data sources such as the F.A.S.T. Benchmark Assessments for Math and ELA/Reading, District and State mandated assessments Algebra, Geometry, Civics, and Science. After data has been analyzed by the team, resources are identified that will supplement student learning in the classroom. Resources that are suggested and agreed upon include but are not limited to allocations for Personnel such as Reading/Math Coaches, Reading/Math Classroom Assistants, supplemental materials that are not provided by the district but are research-based to support our subject goals, and Professional Development instructors/materials to continue growth for our teachers.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

To disseminate information to all stakeholders in regard to the School Improvement Plan, Orange Park Junior High will use the digital School Newsletter, share on social media outlets that the plan is available for review in the front office of OPJ in the 23-24 Title I Binder, on our schools webpage at <https://opj.myoneclay.net/title-1>, and during the School Advisory Council meetings with stakeholders.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

To build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students, and keep parents informed of their child's progress, Orange Park Junior High plans to build the culture of the school through Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). With a focus on positive behavior, high expectations, clear communication, and a structure for addressing misbehavior, OPJ will be able to work closely with families and make sure they understand that there must be a partnership in order for students to succeed. OPJ will also focus on inviting families to campus throughout the year to participate in Parent and Family Engagement Events to learn how to support their students education. The Family Engagement Plan can be found on our schools webpage at <https://opj.myoneclay.net/title-1>.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

In order to strengthen the academic programs in Orange Park Junior High, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, OPJ plans to focus on growing our educators through Professional Development with the help of CCDS district support leaders. Our main goals this year is to increase proficiency in ELA/Reading and Mathematics. Utilizing district support leaders in those subjects will allow for teachers to gain more knowledge of their respective subjects, plan better, and understand more, especially during targeted Professional Learning Community meetings. OPJ also plans to provide students with more learning opportunities, such as tutoring services, to gain more knowledge and receive assistance when needed.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Orange Park Junior High's School Improvement Plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, to support all of the students at OPJ. The plan focuses on using resources that are specifically correlated to their needs therefore able to better support the students.

Clay County Schools

Pace Center For Girls Clay School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pace Center For Girls Clay

1241 BLANDING BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

www.pacecenter.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Pace Center for Girls, Inc. (Pace) provides girls and young women an opportunity for a better future through education, counseling, training, and advocacy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pace envisions a world where all girls and young women have POWER in a JUST and EQUITABLE society.

Pace's 9 Guiding Principles

1. Honor the Female Spirit
2. Invest in the Future
3. Value the Wisdom of Time
4. Act With Integrity and Positive Intent
5. Embrace Growth and Change
6. Focus on Strengths
7. Exhibit Courage
8. Seek Excellence
9. Create Partnerships

Pace values all girls and young women, believing each one deserves an opportunity to find her voice, achieve her potential and celebrate a life defined by responsibility, dignity, serenity, and grace.

It is the policy of PACE to serve girls ages 11-17 years old who are at risk of school failure and/or dropout and/or involvement in the Juvenile Justice system. To determine if Pace is the most appropriate placement, based on the girl's assessed needs, a designated staff member will administer a needs assessment which includes a suicide risk screening component to the girl during the Intake interview. Pace utilizes the Prevention Assessment Tool (PAT) as the needs assessment at intake. The PAT is an instrument designated and approved by the Department of Juvenile Justice.

Pace will make every attempt to provide services to at-risk girls. However, Pace may not be able to meet the needs of all girls referred effectively. In the event that Pace is not the most appropriate placement, a referral to a more suitable placement for the girl will be offered by designated Pace staff. Girls are accepted into the program regardless of race, color, religion, creed or sexual orientation. The decision to attend Pace is voluntarily made by each individual girl and her parent/guardian. In some instances, Pace accepts court-ordered placements in accordance with local contracts and girls' needs. There is no charge for girls to attend Pace. When applicable, Pace may assist with necessary student expenses, including bus fare, school supplies, and personal needs.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stocks, Katelyn	Academic Coordinator	
Reynolds, Carla	Program Director	
Woodberry, Sylvia	Social Service Manager	
Thomas, Genelle	Executive Director	Works with CCDS for the development of our district contract. She is also responsible for the areas of financial resources development for the entire program. Supervises middle management.
Reynoso, Deborah	Office Manager	She is responsible for financial management, contract management, facility, and vehicle management, staff training, and oversees most administrative tasks. She supervises the receptionist.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We work with many stakeholders beyond staff, students, and board members. As a non-profit, we rely on volunteers and building community partnerships. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment is critical.

Stakeholder

groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored through our quarterly progress monitoring (i.e., STAR and FAST). The Academic Coordinator monitors this data and RTI data to affirm achievement for students performing below grade level. RTI is revised quarterly for maximum growth. The committee will also complete a mid-year review. Through this monitoring and review, the plan may be revised, if necessary, to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	2022-23: Unsatisfactory 2021-22: Commendable 2020-21: Commendable

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	25			40			17		
ELA Learning Gains				40			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	0			10			5		
Math Learning Gains							40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	0						18		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*	15						17		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	10
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	40
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	48
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	25			0			0	15				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	40		10								
SWD												
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	17	60		5	40		18	17				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Middle school math showed the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 school year. The 6th, 8th, and 10th graders are below district average for English/Language Arts. Contributing factors are the loss of the ELA teacher and lack of math teacher until the spring semester.

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

The scores from 8th and 10th grade declined from the previous school year (2021-2022) evidenced by the FSA English/Language Arts scores. The English teacher left during the spring semester.

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.

The 8th grade ELA FAST scores had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Contributing factors include trauma, environment, and school loss.

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

The Algebra I data showed the most improvement. The focus of the previous School Improvement Plan was Algebra. Last year's data showed 0% of Pace students passed the Algebra I EOC. This year we showed a 30% increase in passing scores. The 9th grade ELA scores improved and was above the state average for the 2022-2023 school year. We implemented daily intervention for students utilizing Khan Academy. Once we hired a math teacher, they implemented a math "boot camp" that focused on Algebra and passing the BEST Algebra exam.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

N/A due to no data.

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

1. ELA scores
2. Pre-Algebra Skills
3. Attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The FAST ELA trend showed a need for improvement across all grade levels, specifically 6th, 8th, and 10th grade. All three grades showed little or no growth across the PM1 to PM3 averages as well as were below state and district averages. 65% of the students in 6th, 8th, and 10th grade that took the test were below state and district averages.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of May 2024, the percentage of girls scoring at or above the district and state level will increase from 35% to 45% using RTI, as measured by the FAST ELA.

Monitoring:

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

The STAR assessment will be administered every 12 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katelyn Stocks (katelyn.stocks@pacecenter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Khan Academy will be used with intervention groups 2-3 times a week by tier for 20-30 minutes a session.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Khan Academic provides real-time insights that help teachers make daily instruction decisions. In a recent study, Khan Academy students were over twice as likely to meet grade-level standards. Khan Academy personalizes learning so that students can practice at their own pace, first filling in the gapers in their understanding and then accelerating their learning with tailored instruction to meet the needs of every student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Khan Academy

Person Responsible: Katelyn Stocks (katelyn.stocks@pacecenter.org)

By When: May 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 8th grade FAST Math scores showed a significant gap between the district and state averages to Pace Clay. The district average scaled score was 344, the state average was 335, and Pace's scaled score was 315. 63% of the 8th-grade students scored below the district and/or state average demonstrating an achievement gap.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of May 2024, the percentage of girls scoring at or above the district and state level will increase from 37% to 47% using RTI, as measured by the FAST Math assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The STAR Assessment will be administered every 12 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katelyn Stocks (katelyn.stocks@pacecenter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Khan Academy will be used with intervention groups 2-3 times a week by tier for 20-30 minutes a session.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Khan Academic provides real-time insights that help teachers make daily instruction decisions. In a recent study, Khan Academy students were over twice as likely to meet grade-level standards. Khan Academy personalizes learning so that students can practice at their own pace, first filling in the gapers in their understanding and then accelerating their learning with tailored instruction to meet the needs of every student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Khan Academy

Person Responsible: Katelyn Stocks (katelyn.stocks@pacecenter.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2021 school year, our attendance rate was 61%. In the 2022 school year, our attendance rate was 72%, an increase, but still below the expected 80% rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Center-wide attendance will improve from 72% to at least 75% for the 2022 school year with an attendance plan in place.

Monitoring:

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

Daily attendance is taken, and attendance reports will be generated monthly in Impacts for review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carla Reynolds (carla.reynolds@pacecenter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Girls with 100% Monthly Perfect Attendance will be entered into a drawing for a gift card, recognized at Growth & Change ceremonies, and receive four dress-down passes for the following month. Girls with 80% and above attendance will be recognized at Growth & Change ceremonies and receive two dress-down passes for the following month. Girls who improve attendance by at least 10% in a month will receive one dress-down pass. Girls with three months of perfect attendance will be eligible to go to the salon with the ED. Girls with six months of perfect attendance will be eligible to go to lunch and the salon with a staff member of choice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy improved 2022's attendance by 11%.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Members of the SIP Committee will meet with district members over school improvement monthly to review SIP efforts and expenditures.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Stakeholders will receive information on viewing the SIP at <https://www.floridacims.org/plans> and the ability to obtain a copy of the SIP upon request. The SIP will be made available in another language upon request.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Pace conducts Monthly Parent Contacts (Meetings) to review a girl's academic and social service progress. At this time, progress on academic and social service goals is discussed. Pace also provides quarterly family engagement activities, including guest speakers and community resources. The Board of Directors meets monthly to plan community and school events to support Pace's mission.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Pace provides a daily intervention/study hall block. Any girl below grade level in math or ELA participates in RTI. Girls on or above grade level participate in enrichment activities. Pace will offer the PSAT and SAT this year. Math boot camps will be provided to strengthen math skills. Pace is updating its library to offer girls more opportunities to engage with literature.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Pace partners with St. Johns River State College. The college provides scholarships for Pace graduates in collaboration with AT&T pioneers. Pace has reintroduced its partnership with the Delores Barr Weaver Policy Center. Pace provides a GED program in collaboration with the Adult Education Center in Clay County Schools. Pace is implementing a partnership with the Adult Education Program in Clay County to provide CTE certification classes.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Pace girls are assigned counselors and an academic adviser upon enrolling in the program. The counselor meets with students bi-weekly and develops a plan for growth in identified areas. The advisors meet with students bi-weekly to discuss current academic progress and goals. The students are provided 6 week long psycho-educational groups that cover topics such as self-esteem, social skills, conflict resolution, and substance use. There is an on-site licensed mental health therapist that is available to take a caseload. When transitioning from the program, they are contacted monthly by a transition counselor for a minimum of a year. This helps ensure any needed resources are provided.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students are given opportunities to tour college campuses and have people come speak to them about their career choice. Recruiters have come to speak with students about joining the military. The ASVAB will be administered to eligible students this year through Jacksonville MEPS.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Students take the STAR assessment every 12 weeks. Students participate in daily intervention/study hall. The ESE specialist includes staff in IEP and 504 meetings with students and parents. Students are reviewed monthly with all staff to discuss progress.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Each subject area has a specific instructional coach through the National Office. Teachers also have access to training through Pace Learns (our internal PD) and PD provided by Clay County Schools.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Clay County Schools

Plantation Oaks Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Plantation Oaks Elementary School

4150 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://poe.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Plantation Oaks Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Marks, Kim	Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing, and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and ensure proper security, maintenance, and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/ reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including: interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff, and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment, and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district-wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to the school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Standards Assessments, End-of-Course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students, and the</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.</p>
Suhr, Casey	Teacher, K-12	<p>The teacher is responsible directly to the principal for the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students. Establish a classroom climate conducive to learning classroom management. Demonstrate an interest in and a willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom. Demonstrate personal enthusiasm and generate student enthusiasm. Become alert to the physical needs of the students. Demonstrate preparation. Demonstrate general knowledge of the subject area. Provide for students of varying ability through the use of a variety of activities, techniques, questions, materials, and student input (compensate for individual deprivations). Exhibit good judgment with regard to personal feelings of colleagues, parents, and students. Communicate effectively with others and exhibit a willingness to share ideas and talents with colleagues. Evaluate student's progress and keep appropriate records. Perform other duties as requested by the Principal.</p>
Mounts, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	<p>The teacher is responsible directly to the principal for the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students. Establish a classroom climate conducive to learning classroom management. Demonstrate an interest in and a willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom. Demonstrate personal enthusiasm and generate student enthusiasm. Become alert to the physical needs of the students. Demonstrate preparation. Demonstrate general knowledge of the subject area. Provide for students of varying ability through the use of a variety of activities, techniques, questions, materials, and student input (compensate for individual deprivations). Exhibit good judgment with regard to personal feelings of colleagues, parents, and students. Communicate effectively with others and exhibit a willingness to share ideas and talents with colleagues. Evaluate student's progress and keep appropriate records. Perform other duties as requested by the Principal.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

All stakeholders are invited to attend and actively participate in our School Advisory Council. The School Advisory Council allows for a representative from each group of stakeholders to be represented during each meeting. There are representations of teacher, staff and parent/community members.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be reviewed throughout the school year with faculty and staff. The school's vision and mission supports the SIP. The SIP will help support the focus of the effective implementation and impact of increasing that academic achievement of students.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	21	17	24	11	25	15	14	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	16	9	14	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	23	13	19	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	16	9	14	0	0	44

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	13	8	10	0	0	34

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	11	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	11	4	11	8	5	12	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	27	22	34	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	25	23	41	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	30	27	22	34	0	0	113

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	10	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	11	4	11	8	5	12	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	27	22	34	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	25	23	41	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	30	27	22	34	0	0	113

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	10	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60			62			63		
ELA Learning Gains	59			59			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52			47			43		
Math Achievement*	65			62			68		
Math Learning Gains	65			59			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62			54			44		
Science Achievement*	75			61			47		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	54			57			53		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	58			
HSP	66			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	56			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	59	52	65	65	62	75					54
SWD	27	38	30	40	51	50	50					40
ELL	50	59	55	58	66	60	90					54
AMI												
ASN	84	61		95	89							
BLK	51	58	55	55	60	58	67					
HSP	61	68	61	66	70	67	81					54
MUL	63	68		75	78	70	70					
PAC												
WHT	65	50	25	70	58	50	79					
FRL	48	58	40	59	64	63	64					52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	62	59	47	62	59	54	61					57
SWD	29	37	28	36	52	48	26					
ELL	52	57		57	55	56	50					57
AMI												
ASN	90	67		80	73							
BLK	53	55	46	55	56	55	56					
HSP	55	58	45	58	46	42	58					55
MUL	59	50		67	59		45					
PAC												
WHT	74	68	45	69	68		74					
FRL	50	60	45	59	61	63	49					56

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	56	43	68	58	44	47					53
SWD	30	35	34	42	44	35	35					29
ELL	55	51	40	52	56	40	38					53
AMI												
ASN	75	59		80	78							
BLK	57	55	50	63	52	39	37					
HSP	65	52	40	65	50	18	48					52
MUL	56	44		61	46		30					
PAC												
WHT	69	62	48	76	67	65	61					
FRL	57	54	44	63	57	43	41					57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Proficiency in the area of both Math and ELA has the greatest need for improvement. As learning gains ranked highest across the board in a multitude of areas, general proficiency and achievement are our targets. While continuing the remediation practices for students in need of intervention, we want to raise the bar of expectations for proficiency numbers on the whole group moving forward.

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

Proficiency in the area of both Math and ELA has the greatest need for improvement. As learning gains ranked highest across the board in a multitude of areas, general proficiency and achievement are our targets. While continuing the remediation practices for students in need of intervention, we want to raise the bar of expectations for proficiency numbers on the whole group moving forward.

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.

Proficiency in the area of both Math and ELA. Due to students lack of social exposure over the last couple of years, schools are needing to reinforce the social and organizational norms within the brick and mortar style learning. Having students back in the classroom receiving traditional in-person instruction, should continue to help raise the school's scores to at least the proficiency level from the 2023 school grade calculations.

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

Administrator lead intensive PLCs in the area of district initiatives helped with a focus on student proficiency and reading in the content area. Additionally adding an additional ESE allocation allowed students in need of remediation and ESE services to have the aide that they needed in terms of math achievement and learning gains for those students most in need. The additional allocation provided for an ESE teacher per grade level and thus allowed those ESE teachers to focus in a greater capacity on the needs of the particular issues facing students learning on that grade level.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The number of referable offenses will be reduced by 10% in the 2023-2024 school year when compared against the previous year. The number of absences will be reduced by 5% in the 2023-2024 school year when compared against the previous year.

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

Increasing gains in ELA, Math, and Science across the grade levels. Increasing student engagement is necessary in having a positive impact on testing gains. We are moving towards a new student information management system, that will incorporate data, testing, MTSS, among other things. This new system should allow us to easily monitor students, as well as, view them as a whole child/student in

order to better meet their needs. Additionally, the new ELA curriculum, the BEST standards, and the Lexia program is going to help us accelerate our learning and achievement.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A review of the state testing data shows room for improvement across the tested grade bands with regard to the school's ELA and Math proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

POE's goal is to increase ELA proficiency in each of the tested grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th) by 3%. And a specific 5% improvement in the ESE population. This will be measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through school-wide testing with both Lexia diagnostics, as well as, the new Savvas testing platform incorporated with our curriculum. This will also be monitored using PM 1 and PM 2 FAST testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will utilize Lexia and the new Savvas ELA curriculum, and Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions via the MTSS process to review and remediate for students demonstrating deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborate with their peers during common planning to discuss problems of practice and solutions offered via the teacher toolbox. Professional Development Opportunities will be provided during PLC's. District Curriculum Specialists will be actively involved in Learning Walks and Professional Development Opportunities for the Savvas curriculum.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Common Planning
2. Using Lexia program
3. Professional Development Opportunities during PLC
4. Utilize District Curriculum Specialists

Person Responsible: Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

By When: After the FAST PM3

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A review of the state testing data shows room for improvement across the tested grade bands with regard to the school's math proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

POE's goal is to increase Math proficiency in each of the tested grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th) by 3%. And a specific 5% improvement in the ESE population. This will be measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through school-wide testing with both iReady diagnostics, Eureka, as well as the Synergy testing platform incorporated with our curriculum. This will also be monitored by the PM1 and PM2 FAST assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will utilize the iReady toolbox, the new Synergy testing platform, and Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions via the MTSS process to review and remediate for students demonstrating deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborate with their peers during common planning to discuss problems of practice and solutions offered via the teacher toolbox. Professional Development Opportunities will be provided during PLC's. District Curriculum

Specialists will be actively involved in Learning Walks and Professional Development Opportunities

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Common Planning
2. Provide iReady Toolbox
3. Eureka
4. Professional Development Opportunities during PLC
5. Utilize District Curriculum Specialists

Person Responsible: Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

By When: After the FAST PM3

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Safeschoolsforale.com as well as data of the school's discipline and referral history shows the need for a reduction in school-wide incidents.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of referable offenses will be reduced by 10% in the 2023-2024 school year when compared against the previous year.

Monitoring:

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

The number of referrals reported will be reviewed throughout the year. The PBIS Team will look at this data monthly on the PBIS meeting dates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Safe schools, PBIS, Soaring Hawk Tickets, and school positive behaviour incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Safe schools and PBIS will be utilized to help aid students in their own behavior monitoring as schoolwide supports. Schoolwide expectations will be displayed throughout the school as visual reminders for all stakeholders.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Implement the PBIS system school-wide
2. Review each month the number of incidents reported
3. Soaring Hawk Program
- 4.Engagement

Person Responsible: Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year

Clay County Schools

Rideout Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://roe.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to increase the academic performance of all students. RideOut Elementary, working in conjunction with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Based on the premise that all students can learn, our teachers will provide opportunities for each child to experience maximized academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

RideOut Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and technologically advanced society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stewart, Trisha	Principal	The principal will be responsible for providing leadership in the development, revision and implementation of the school improvement plan.
Bright, Steven	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will be responsible for providing leadership in the development or revision and implementation of the school improvement plan.
Erwin, Denise	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Como, Ava	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Reneau, Kim	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Brown, Erin	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Shipley, Cassandra	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Pasternak, Anna	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Tison, Cecilia	Teacher, ESE	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Selby, Lynda	Teacher, K-12	
Rountree, Sarah	Psychologist	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our school based leadership team has met to discuss data from the previous school year. We have determined the next steps in supporting student growth and the necessary means to close academic gaps with individual students, subgroups as well as grade levels. Parents will be involved in the process, when our data and proposed plan is shared at our first SAC meeting. We will share the data from the previous school year and all baseline data we have prior to the meeting. It is important to gain parent input and support in the learning process. As we discuss the data, we will discuss resources and support we can provide to parents so they can be true partners in their child(rens) education. We will discuss barriers that we can avoid when working towards proficiency of all students.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

As our school based leadership team along with our Schools literacy leadership team we will meet to discuss the SIP monthly and our progress towards the goals set within the plan. As there is a need to adjust based on progress or lack of progress we will work as a team to develop adjustments to meet the needs of all students being served at RideOut Elementary.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	16	10	18	12	11	11	21	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	2	1	7	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	1	2	0	6	10	18	16	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	18	15	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	7	9	7	6	3	10	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	4	17	10	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	29	4	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	7	9	7	6	3	10	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	4	17	10	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	29	4	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65			65			70		
ELA Learning Gains	60			59			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44			65			56		
Math Achievement*	72			75			70		
Math Learning Gains	68			77			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59			68			59		
Science Achievement*	64			71			67		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	73			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	60	44	72	68	59	64					
SWD	47	45	43	45	42	43	45					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	40		29	40							
HSP	76	65		82	70							
MUL	68	65		82	83							
PAC												
WHT	65	59	52	70	66	61	58					
FRL	55	55	50	59	63	52	48					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	59	65	75	77	68	71					
SWD	38	35		42	52	46	45					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			50								
HSP	61	47		79	73		64					
MUL	63			76								
PAC												
WHT	69	59	57	76	74	65	72					
FRL	56	58		64	73		65					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	71	56	70	68	59	67					
SWD	45	60	52	45	60	60	39					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	50	65		50	58							
HSP	74	89		71	74							
MUL	89	67		89	75							
PAC												
WHT	70	69	47	71	69	64	67					
FRL	63	66	54	60	60	57	59					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Based on our 22-23 SY FAST data our 6th Grade ELA proficiency level was the lowest with 46%. The contributing factors for this decrease was a change in ELA instructors mid year. This group of students were 64% on the previous years FSA. The inconsistency of instruction did have a great impact on these students. The same group of students scored 80% proficient in the Math FAST assessment.

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

The area that have the greatest decline from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year was our ELA Proficiency. This dropped from 65% to 56%, the decline that impacted the level of proficiency in our 6th grade class was a large factor in this overall decrease.

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.

The area that had the greatest gap between state and school scores was ELA proficiency in 6th grade with a difference of 5% points below the state average.

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

Science had a growth of 2% from the previous year moving up to 66% proficient.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Continuing to encourage students to be present and on time to school as it directly affects their ability to be successful academically both in the class and on state assessments.

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

Our number one focus will be on ELA proficiency
We will also focus on our ELA BQ and Math BQ students this school year.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

An area of focus for RideOut Elementary for the 23-24 school year will be PBIS with a strong emphasis on schoolwide expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

When our students are made aware of schoolwide expectations we expect to see a 10% decrease each 9 weeks in our Behavior Incident Notification (BIN) and discipline incidents.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored each month our PBIS team meets to discuss success of our program and needs for improvement. The schoolwide Behavior Incident Notification (BIN) data as well as discipline incidents will be reviewed and the PBIS team will discuss ways to address specific behaviors within our plan. We will determine next steps and needs to review expectations per grade level, class or even specific students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steven Bright (steven.bright@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our school has purchased PBIS rewards as a means to reward and incentive our students for making positive behavioral choices. Each month will also review and assess this data collected. We can look at grade level, class and student data specifically. This data discussion will allow us to determine incentives and ways we can motivate our students and reward good choices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to provide models of expected behaviors and to review schoolwide expectations, this can be done by including students in a positive manner. With the use of this program, students are rewarded immediately with points and they also earn the opportunity to earn tangible rewards throughout the school year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Step 1: PBIS team meets to discuss new PBIS plan

R.A.C.E to success and Schoolwide Expectations

Step 2: Purchase PBIS Rewards (prizes for quarterly incentive store)

Step 3: Train teachers and staff on the implementation of our schoolwide expectations as well rewards program to motivate and support each student. Explain the Behavior Intervention Notification and how this will allow us to collect behavior data to support students.

Step 4: Data Analysis during monthly PBIS meetings based on School Wide Expectation implementation, behavior data (BIN's) and students shopping in our PBIS store with earned points through PBIS rewards.

Person Responsible: Steven Bright (steven.bright@myoneclay.net)

By When: PBIS plan, School Wide expectations, teacher training will be completed during preplanning. PBIS meetings monthly with agendas

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As an MTSS model school our schools literacy leadership team will be looking at data and determining academic and behavioral next steps for all students. The need to be intentional comes from the testing data collected last school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Literacy Leadership team will be reviewing baseline data provided by our FAST PM1 assessment as well as our Acadience data and we will determine current students with substantial reading deficiency. Each student will be provided MTSS in order to increase their reading levels. 10% of our students will increase their scores in PM 2 and PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress during biweekly data chats as well as monthly School Based Literacy Leadership team meetings with county support monthly. We will talk about each student that is considered to have substantial reading deficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Each student deemed to have substantial reading deficiency will be provided with MTSS nsaed on their specific needs. All other students that are following below proficient will have a data discussion based on their classroom data as well as PM data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each student will need specific programs and supports based on their needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Universal Data Collected per grade level
Analysis of Data during biweekly data chats
Identify students needs and next steps
Provide steps to address needs and progress
Agendas for Literacy Leadership Team
Literacy Leadership Team Meetings Monthly

Address students academic and behavioral needs based on data collected
Follow steps, supporting subgroups as well as individual students.

Person Responsible: Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

By When: Universal Screeners completed by 9/5 based on attendance Data Meetings (biweekly) Grade Level needs assessments (monthly for literacy leadership) Literacy Leadership Meetings Monthly (Agendas for progress and next steps)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Area of focus will be addressing our Black/ African American subgroup that hits 33% in FPPI below the 41% minimum mark.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a school we will identify each subgroup being served on our campus, we will identify our Black/ African American students and determine their level. Our goal will be to increase to 45% or higher in order to increase above the 41% minimum requirement.

Monitoring:

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

As a school we will monitor each subgroup during each school based, universal screeners as well as State testing. We will break these numbers down by grade level and discuss supports provided to each subgroups, especially our black/ african american subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All students will be provided with strong Tier 1 instruction with the use of provided supplementary curriculum. As needed students will be provided with Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports based on collected data in order to support academic gap closure.

There will be an increase in small group instruction, individualized academic supports based on county programs and materials used.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Intentional instruction of each student, especially focusing on our black/ african american subgroups will provide the interventions in order to close academic gaps. The progress will be documented through biweekly data meetings as well as school based literacy leadership monthly meetings.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identify our student population that falls within this subgroup

Share this subgroup data with grade levels

Determine grade level needs to support all subgroups with a strong focus on our black/ african american subgroup

Biweekly data meetings/ PLC Data chats
 Monthly Literacy Leadership meetings

Person Responsible: Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

By When: Identify Students per subgroups September Share Subgroups September-October Grade Level Needs: September and ongoing Data Chats: Biweekly Literacy Leadership Meetings: Monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

As we monitor the needs of our students, we will evaluate the needs for interventions. This will be discuss and monitored during each of our literacy leadership meetings. Each student will be provided with specific interventions through MTSS or goals on their IEP if this pertains to individual students. If there in a need to purchase approved supplemental materials to meet the needs of our ATSI subgroups, this will be discuss during our literacy leadership team meetings.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Ridgeview Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Ridgeview Elementary School

421 JEFFERSON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rve.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

** (The Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP can be made available in most languages)***

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ridgeview Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McHugh-Clark, Judi	Assistant Principal	Ensure PD occurs to ensure proper implementation of procedures and materials to meet the school's goals.
Schumacher, Courtney	Principal	Leading PD on and monitoring fidelity of implementation of the school's goals.
Worsdell, Lacey	Instructional Coach	Leading individual and small group coaching with instructional and support staff on, and monitoring fidelity of implementation of the school's goals.
Makar, Kristin	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaching and MTSS
Fitzsimons, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead
Wade, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead
Wood, Julieanne	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead
Bodie, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead
Lyons, Linda	Teacher, ESE	Team Lead
Austin, Kelsie	Teacher, ESE	Team Lead
Tufano, Jame	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead
Cunningham, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Leadership Team will formulate a draft plan including the goal of increasing vocabulary knowledge in all subject areas across all grade levels to increase proficiency in math and reading. SAC will review the draft, make necessary changes and additions, and approve the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Plan will be reviewed during monthly team leader meetings and by the SAC meetings three times per year. Teachers, instructional coaches and administration will meet after all required tests to review data with an emphasis on the data of the bottom quartile and SWD students.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	16	19	8	19	8	29	17	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	5	8	4	6	11	21	17	0	0	72
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	16	23	16	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	13	16	5	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	7	7	2	3	3	4	0	0	29

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	29	6	5	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	21	5	4	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	7	7	2	3	3	4	0	0	29

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	29	6	5	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	21	5	4	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	7	7	2	3	3	4	0	0	29

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60			65			70		
ELA Learning Gains	56			68			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54			56			56		
Math Achievement*	70			61			74		
Math Learning Gains	76			57			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70			63			65		
Science Achievement*	81			79			60		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	50								

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	56			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	68			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	65			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	56	54	70	76	70	81					50
SWD	39	44	37	53	72	64	84					
ELL	55			82								50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	63	50	67	64	58	71					
HSP	52	48	64	73	85	92	64					
MUL	56	36		73	60							
PAC												
WHT	64	58	52	70	77	69	88					
FRL	54	55	59	65	76	70	78					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	65	68	56	61	57	63	79					
SWD	47	56	50	39	46	50	70					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51	64	60	49	74		58					
HSP	71	72		59	61		80					
MUL	67			60								
PAC												
WHT	68	68	53	66	52	40	83					
FRL	64	68	56	57	59	60	77					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	64	56	74	66	65	60					
SWD	51	47	52	53	54	61	25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52	55	45	55	68	73	50					
HSP	83	60		83	70							
MUL	77	56		86	67							
PAC												
WHT	71	67	53	76	66	59	56					
FRL	68	60	53	68	64	67	61					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Data shows a steady decline in ELA scores yearly since 2019. ELA achievement remained at 60% in 2023, equaling last year's score: showing no improvement from 2022. Sixty percent is a 10% drop from a 2019, high of 70%. This is a downward trend in all ELA areas, gains and LQ. All subgroups were affected, with Students with Disabilities (SWD) being a particular area of concern. Achievement in ELA scores from SWD dropped from 51% in 2019 to 39% in 2022. Current SWD data for 2023 indicates a proficiency of 39.5%.

High teacher turnover, long term substitutes in place of qualified teachers. and staff absence are contributing factors. In our lowest performing grade, lack of fidelity to approved curriculum and standards is a possible cause.

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

Only 25.25% of the tested population are proficient in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary. Again, teacher turnover, full time teaching substitutes and teacher absence contribute to this score. Also a lack of focus school-wide on this particular indicator.

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.

State scores in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary show a proficiency of 27%. Our data shows 24.25% proficiency. While our data is not significantly lower, neither proficiency is satisfactory.

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

Reading Informational Text remained the highest area of proficiency for the last three years. There has been a strong emphasis instructionally on nonfiction text these last three years.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Proficiency in all aspects of and all grade levels In ELA is an area of concern. Scores have been on a steady and substantial decline over the last three years. Also, SWD ELA students showed statistically negligible increase in proficiency: from 39% last year, to 39.5% in 2023.

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

Building capacity in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary with an emphasis on vocabulary in all subject areas.

Building capacity in Math, especially in the area of Number Sense and Mathematical Reasoning, through engaging in vocabulary

Building our capacity as a school positively through building relationships with each other and families.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be ELA Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary from 24.50% to 50.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Through frequent walk-throughs, administrators will ensure fidelity to the BEST standards, the use of only district adopted and approved supplementary materials, attendance at bi-weekly PLC meetings in which educators review data and make plans for rigorous, standards-based lessons. The Student Success Team will create an intervention plan on an individual basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ensuring fidelity to the BEST standards, using only district adopted and approved supplementary materials, weekly PLC meetings in which educators review data and make plans for rigorous, standards-based lessons. Implementing the following structure in all subjects across all grade levels: When conducting in-depth, explicit vocabulary instruction, these steps will be followed:

Pronounce the word, write it, and read it.

Tell students what the word means using a student-friendly definition.

Say more about the word; give examples of its use and say what it is not.

Ask questions about the word's meaning that can be answered "yes" or "no."

Elicit word use by students. (Stahl & Nagy, 2006)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

"Vocabulary accounts for approximately 50-60% variance in reading comprehension. Once students learn the alphabet code, vocabulary is the single most important factor in reading comprehension."(Stahl & Nagy, 2006)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers must implicitly teach, approximately ten carefully chosen, high utility words per week. Words must be central to understanding the subject or the text. When conducting in-depth, explicit vocabulary instruction, these steps will be followed:

Pronounce the word, write it, and read it.

Tell students what the word means using a student-friendly definition.

Say more about the word; give examples of its use and say what it is not.

Ask questions about the word's meaning that can be answered "yes" or "no."

Elicit word use by students. (Stahl & Nagy, 2006)

Person Responsible: Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math, Number Sense and Mathematical Reasoning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our Number Sense and Mathematical Reasoning from 44.50% to 60.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Through frequent walk-throughs, administrators will ensure fidelity to the BEST standards, the use of only district adopted and approved supplementary materials, attendance at bi-weekly PLC meetings in which educators review data and make plans for rigorous, standards-based lessons. The Student Success Team will create an intervention plan on an individual basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ensuring fidelity to the BEST standards, using only district adopted and approved supplementary materials, weekly PLC meetings in which educators review data and make plans for rigorous, standards-based lessons. Implementing the following structure in all subjects across all grade levels:

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The need for work on Number Sense and Mathematical Reasoning is evident from FAST results. The above strategies are researched based and best practice.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will create and implement a small group rotation that focuses on differentiated student needs; Title 1 assistants will be scheduled according to student needs. PLCs and PD planned and facilitated by Title I coach and/or administration will address highly-effective small group strategies, including planning and execution; Professional development led curriculum coaches, specialist and lead teachers. Provide TDE time for teachers to visit other math teachers classrooms on campus and off campus. Utilize math programs such as Reflex and Frax to increase student fluency in numbers and operations. Edulastic Enterprise license for creating formative assessments that are BEST standards aligned; ALEKS

for K-5 or IXL. Use technology for online research-based programs to support and engage students in remediation and practice.

Person Responsible: Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on Climate and Culture Survey data, our area of focus will be student engagement through Intentionally building effective teacher, student, family relationships.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our capacity as a school positively through building relationships with each other and families from 29.50% to 60.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Admin/Teacher shared walkthrough log-add more detail specifically looking for positive acknowledgement from adults toward students. This data will be shared at monthly PLC meetings. This will strengthen the relationships between adults and students by building a positive relationship. We will monitor the data collected through Pride Awards, the number of attendees at instructional content Title 1 events and their specific feedback. We will also monitor the number of, and the code of conduct infractions on discipline referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Development on:

Teachers Possess the Belief of the Importance of Engaging Families

Intentionally Build Effective Teacher-Student Relationships

Teachers Engage Families in Constructing Goals-Monitoring Progress-Supporting Learning Together

Active Classroom (High Student Engagement)

Specific, targeted 7 Mindsets lessons

Book Study using the Flooded Brain-a guide to Help Regulate Emotions by Allison Edwards

Have You Filled a Bucket Today? by Carol McCloud

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

"Positive student relationships are fundamental to success. When students feel supported, they're more likely to engage in learning and have better academic outcomes. Plus, when students have positive interactions with teachers, they have fewer behavioral problems." (Kaufman, 2020)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Weekly, monitored PRIDE Academy lessons, systems of reward and acknowledgement, Book Study using *Flooded: A Brain -Based Guide to Help Regulate Emotions* By Allison Edwards - All teachers will participate monthly during PLCs, Teacher PD on *Fostering Relationships* Admin/Teacher shared walkthrough log Add more detail specifically looking for positive acknowledgement from adults toward students. This data will be shared monthly during PLCs. This will strengthen the relationship between adults and students on campus by building a positive relationship.

PBIS - Pride Tickets and Awards

Have You Filled a Bucket Today? By Carol McCloud

PBIS classroom and campus wide clear expectations through signage around campus that promotes our core values in PBIS.

Administration and teacher leaders will attend conferences such as the FASA conference in the Summer 2024- this will provide PD to admin and teacher leaders around building and implementing a strong PBIS climate in our school.

Person Responsible: Courtney Schumacher (courtney.schumacher@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes

Clay County Schools

Ridgeview High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Ridgeview High School

466 MADISON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rhs.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Ridgeview High School is to develop lifelong learners who meet the global demands of 21st century skills through a challenging educational program which embraces diversity and unity, instills integrity and character, and promotes Respect, Honor and Scholarship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing ALL Students for Success in A Global Economy

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Murphy, Becky	Principal	Principal Becky Murphy serves as the facilitator of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team and provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, manages the school budget, manages school communications, conducts teacher evaluations, and consistent classroom walkthrough leads planning for school-wide systems of interventions and professional development. Shared decision-making is facilitated through the PLC process, teams of teachers work collaboratively in cycles of inquiry to ensure district learning. The principal ensures that all staff complies with the districtwide school site standards.
Barker, Bryson	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals will assist the Principal with duties as needed which include but are not limited to participating in data collection and analysis, delivering Tier 1 interventions, schoolwide discipline plans, and helping ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. Assistant Principals will also ensure that instruction is aligned with standards, is grade level appropriate and rigorous, through frequent classroom walkthroughs and providing timely feedback to teachers. RHS instructional leaders will also attend Professional Learning Communities working collaboratively with teachers and monitoring designated departmental data in order to increase student achievement.
Stolfus, Jillian	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals will assist the Principal with duties as needed which include but are not limited to participating in data collection and analysis, delivering Tier 1 interventions, schoolwide discipline plans, and helping ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. Assistant Principals will also ensure that instruction is aligned with standards, is grade level appropriate and rigorous, through frequent classroom walkthroughs and providing timely feedback to teachers. RHS instructional leaders will also attend Professional Learning Communities working collaboratively with teachers and monitoring designated departmental data in order to increase student achievement.
Williams, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals will assist the Principal with duties as needed which include but are not limited to participating in data collection and analysis, delivering Tier 1 interventions, schoolwide discipline plans, and helping ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. Assistant Principals will also ensure that instruction is aligned with standards, is grade level appropriate and rigorous, through frequent classroom walkthroughs and providing timely feedback to teachers. RHS instructional leaders will also attend Professional Learning Communities working collaboratively with teachers and monitoring designated departmental data in order to increase student achievement.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team completed individual sections and goal areas in response to data and with input from department chairs. Teachers, students, and SAC members will provide input following the return to school. SIP goals and action steps will be formed and adjusted based on input from each stakeholder group.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Progress Monitoring and state assessments will be analyzed to ensure that progress is made in relationship to SIP goals. SIP goal teams and the school leadership team will meet regularly to review and revise action steps to ensure progress is made toward identified goals.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	328
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55			54			64		
ELA Learning Gains	51			49			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35			31			35		
Math Achievement*	40			41			55		
Math Learning Gains	42			32			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35			32			33		
Science Achievement*	78			67			77		
Social Studies Achievement*	68			72			80		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	98			97			96		
College and Career Acceleration	55			64			68		
ELP Progress	50			70			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	607
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	98

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	47			
HSP	52			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	55	51	35	40	42	35	78	68		98	55	50
SWD	34	43	27	37	42	34	59	28		94	24	
ELL	38	59	60	22	60		77			100	50	50
AMI												
ASN	76	76		50			100	82		100	71	
BLK	45	41	22	27	38	37	68	57		100	39	
HSP	47	46	39	31	42	38	72	59		98	53	44
MUL	62	60		38	37		81	76		95	47	
PAC												
WHT	58	53	39	48	44	32	81	76		98	59	
FRL	49	47	30	32	37	45	72	60		98	47	55

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	49	31	41	32	32	67	72		97	64	70
SWD	31	34	14	39	31	21	39	60		92	26	
ELL	21	55	57	24	41	50	31	42		100	62	70
AMI												
ASN	74	67					67	70		94	82	
BLK	47	44	26	42	33	30	67	69		98	48	
HSP	48	49	31	24	20	29	59	69		98	61	61
MUL	57	49	25	47	37		69	78		100	89	
PAC												
WHT	56	50	32	45	32	33	70	73		95	66	
FRL	48	45	28	38	32	30	65	69		96	57	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	55	35	55	40	33	77	80		96	68	50
SWD	40	44	33	48	42	27	53	67		94	33	
ELL	33	53	36	45						90		50
AMI												
ASN	68	59		73	50		90	100		100	92	
BLK	54	48	18	49	38	33	74	78		100	64	
HSP	65	59	48	59	35	36	77	74		96	69	
MUL	71	76		64	26		90	82		96	59	
PAC												
WHT	66	54	34	55	42	30	76	80		94	68	
FRL	53	47	29	52	39	40	70	78		94	57	46

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Geometry showed the lowest performance at 47% proficiency. We lost a Geometry teacher and brought in a new teacher partway through the year and we had another Geometry teacher with medical conditions that affected that teacher's attendance.

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

Our 9th-grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year; we went from 58% proficiency to 53% proficiency. We had a high turnover in our ELA teachers which led to some shuffling of teachers. Our 9th grade team had to shift to planning with the new standards and as a result, they lost their data focus.

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.

Mathematics learning gains had the greatest gap with Ridgeview at 42% and the state average at 58%. High-achieving math students were taking Algebra at the Junior High level which negatively impacted our scores at the high school level.

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

US History showed the most improvement going from a 70% pass rate in 2022 to 82% pass rate in 2023. Our US History team took a more collaborative approach and were more intentional of their planning of review sessions. They allowed their students to visit each other's classes which gave them the opportunity to gain different perspectives and insights from multiple teachers. It also contributed to the students enhancing their understanding and retention of the subject matter.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

N/A

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

1. Consistent processes for PLC, lesson and unit planning, and individualized support.
2. ELA Achievement for both 9th and 10th grade - Administrators will communicate clear timelines and expectations with the ELA department chair and ELA teachers, and collect weekly feedback and data from the department chair and classroom visits. Unit assessments will be monitored and analyzed for standards mastery during PLCs.
3. Math Achievement for Geometry and Algebra.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The performance level of our lowest 25 percentile was 35%. ELA PLC groups and Intensive Reading will be focusing on FSA scores and strands to identify comprehension trends so that we can have the most impact for the majority of the lower quartile students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ridgeview High School will improve the percentage of students making learning gains in reading from 35% to 39%, as measured by Grade 9/10 ELA Florida Standards Assessments. We will continue our strong focus on standard-based teaching and data-driven instruction with our 9th-grade team. Our high 2 students will continue to be placed with our strongest 9th-grade ELA teacher.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur with the baseline, midyear, and end-of-year district assessments, as well as Lexia. Every nine weeks the ELA and Reading PLCs will review the data and create plans for implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, After):

Activate Prior Knowledge

Question Generation

Monitor Comprehension

Identifying the Main Idea

Paraphrasing

Summarizing

B.E.S.T. ELA Standards - Reading Comprehension

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies will increase engagement, rigor, grade-level appropriate instruction, and academic ownership.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Ensure lessons and student learning activities suit the level of rigor in which students are expected to work. Teachers will use language from the standard and understand the level of rigor needed for mastery. Develop questions at the appropriate complexity level for common formative assessments and instruction and track the progress of students on those standards. Incorporate reading, writing, critical thinking, and collaboration in every lesson. Work together as a PLC team to be responsive to students' specific needs so they can adjust teaching methods and discuss interventions in the PLCs to lead students to success.

Provide explicit vocabulary instruction

Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction

Provide opportunities for an extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation.

All students participate in the thinking through no-opt-out CFUs and exit tickets.

Person Responsible: Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will start this at the beginning of the school year and continue to monitor it throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The performance of our lowest 25 percentile was 35%. Math PLC groups will be focusing on intentional planning and standards-aligned lessons so that we can have the most impact on the majority. Addressing foundational gaps with embedded and continuous spiral reviews will benefit all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ridgeview High School will increase the lower quartile student proficiency from 35% to 40%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur with the baseline, midyear, and end-of-year district assessments. Additionally, we are using ALEKS math diagnostics which provides an adaptive pathway to remediate foundational skills for Algebra, Geometry, and Math for College Liberal Arts students who need a concordant score. The benefit of using ALEKS includes monitoring learning gains in real-time and the ability to target student remediation needs. We have also embedded ACT and SAT practice into Math for College Liberal Arts courses to further support college readiness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jillian Stoltzfus (jillian.stoltzfus@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will strategically place students in our mid to high 2's with our strongest teacher leading small group instruction. With this team, there will be a strong focus on data-driven best practices and standards-based instruction. These strategies include common assessment, the use of district-adopted resources aligned to our standards-based curriculum, and explicit, teacher-directed, small-group instruction and remediation. Algebra 1A/1B Blocks traditionally taught over a single academic year are now over two years, providing students with additional time to assimilate and internalize the upper-level math content. Additionally, students scoring Level 3 and above are scheduled into Algebra 1 Honors sections to push rigor and high expectations. Push-in supports have been added into classrooms to serve students requiring intensive, small-group, direct instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teaching concepts and procedures in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner, using data from common assessments to identify and address gaps, and supported by the use of small group instruction is supported by research. These strategies have been shown to be effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities and ELLs. The combination of more time for struggling learners to synthesize Algebra 1 content with the year-long 1A/1B courses, the use of ALEKS

adaptive, standards-aligned, tiered supports via a technology platform, and the opportunity for our on-grade level students to experience the increased rigor of the honors classroom addresses the needs of all students and lets us work to meet them where they are.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Coach teachers on effectively using step-by-step processes for planning standards-based instruction, focusing on the essential question, "What do we expect our students to know?" Teachers will meet monthly for a directed PD day to utilize standards, test item specs, and district curriculum maps to plan their instruction, remediation, and small group differentiation. These PD days will also focus on increasing our teachers' conceptual knowledge of Algebra. Ensure teachers know how to use district-provided curriculum resources to prepare for standards-based instruction. Continue to use district-provided formative assessments to determine progress toward the stated outcomes and then plan for remediation. Conduct individual conferences with students at least once every 9-weeks to discuss deep content understanding in math and to set student learning goals. Throughout the year, provide spiraled Algebra instruction to provide additional time for Algebra 1 concepts to be retaught and assessed to ensure mastery.

Person Responsible: Jillian Stoltzfus (jillian.stoltzfus@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will start this at the beginning of the school year and continue to monitor it throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Ridgeview High School will focus on Early Warning Systems to identify students who exhibit behavior and or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, the targeted group of at-risk students will increase their overall attendance rate by 10% compared to the previous year and their GPA by 0.5 points compared to the previous semester.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor attendance, grades, and behavior regularly to identify potential issues before they escalate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will offer a range of interventions and support services such as tutoring, counseling, and academic assistance. We will also provide resources to help students develop problem-solving skills, improve study habits, and manage stress effectively. We will also explore alternative education options for students who may not thrive in a traditional high school environment. This could include vocational training programs, online learning, or flexible scheduling to accommodate their specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building a supportive and inclusive school environment is crucial for reaching these students. By offering tailored support, personalized attention, and fostering a sense of belonging, we can greatly increase their chances of staying in school and achieving success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Our attendance administrator will meet monthly with the social worker to identify students. From there they will set up meetings with an attendance team consisting of the grade-level administrator, guidance counselor, social worker, parent, and student.

Person Responsible: Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

By When: We will start this at the beginning of the school year and continue to monitor it throughout the school year.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Robert M. Paterson Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	17

Robert M. Paterson Elementary

5400 PINE AVE, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://pes.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

R.M. Paterson Elementary seeks to create a learning environment where faculty encourages high expectations and collaboratively works together to implement the Florida State Standards that will provide a quality education to all students. Our school promotes a safe, nurturing, and supportive environment that fosters high self esteem and encourages and motivates students to do their personal best. Furthermore, we strive to have parents, teachers, and community members to be actively involved in our student's learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

For teachers to continue to improve their knowledge and perfect their teaching skills through resources, workshops, and training opportunities provided by the school and district. For teachers to enhance their understanding of the new curriculum while implementing these best teaching practices in the classroom, directly impacting students to better prepare them for their continuous academic growth, college and careers in the future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Brian, John	Principal	Daily functions, procedures and operations of the school.
Jewell, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assist Principal in functions of the daily operations of the school.
Stokes, Lori	Assistant Principal	Adhere to the support for the Principal and daily operations of the school.
Kern, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Kern is our Media Center Assistant. She assist our Media Specialist in the daily activities to ensure the Media Center is a productive and welcoming environment.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We have monthly meetings with members of our PFA to discuss the school, community and overall progress of the school. We discuss opportunities, concerns, etc., to all aspects of our campus. Our goal

is to ensure the school, students, staff, community, etc., have all the resources and opportunities to be a part of our campus through activities for students and parents, but also through expressing their voice and/or opinion.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored and reviewed at each SAC meeting. During those meetings, the Principal will communicate the updated school information, data, etc., as it pertains to the progress of our SIP goals. During that time, options, implementations, and revisions, if necessary, will be tabled and future adjustments will be developed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	163	162	166	174	174	172	166	0	0	1177
One or more suspensions	13	17	10	6	7	18	16	0	0	87
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	5	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	11	6	23	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	10	24	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	45	28	18	13	0	0	104

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	6	3	3	10	5	10	0	0	42

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	7	2	8	2	4	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	15	14	15	8	20	14	15	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	3	12	1	1	3	5	3	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	10	25	13	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	11	20	7	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	22	9	14	69	44	43	33	0	0	234

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	23	23	17	9	19	20	21	0	0	132

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	9	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	15	14	15	8	20	14	15	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	3	12	1	1	3	5	3	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	10	25	13	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	11	20	7	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	22	9	14	69	44	43	33	0	0	234

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	23	23	17	9	19	20	21	0	0	132

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	9	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	75			76			79		
ELA Learning Gains	66			66			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			48			61		
Math Achievement*	83			77			80		
Math Learning Gains	79			60			77		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71			35			59		
Science Achievement*	73			79			72		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	64			63			60		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	55			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	54			
HSP	64			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	61			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	66	53	83	79	71	73					64
SWD	50	59	50	68	66	62	31					
ELL	33	52	36	46	67	71						64
AMI												
ASN	100			83								
BLK	47	58	44	63	63	47	53					
HSP	61	65	44	65	77	81	57					
MUL	50	50		69	71							
PAC												
WHT	82	68	62	90	82	69	81					
FRL	58	57	57	68	68	64	52					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	76	66	48	77	60	35	79					63
SWD	49	54	47	51	35	21	46					
ELL	41	40		45	73							63
AMI												
ASN	92			92								
BLK	52	50	38	56	42		50					
HSP	60	54	31	57	55	47	74					63
MUL	68			79								
PAC												
WHT	82	69	54	83	63	32	85					
FRL	58	55	41	60	52	32	61					64

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	79	71	61	80	77	59	72					60
SWD	51	61	54	48	57	50	36					
ELL	61	63	50	70	67	50						60
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	53	63	40	53	57	62	9					
HSP	66	63	52	67	61	40	65					60
MUL	65	58		76	83							
PAC												
WHT	85	73	71	86	84	68	82					
FRL	65	66	57	66	67	46	55					59

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Third grade ELA 71%. The transition to a new state evaluation tool and the test being strictly computer based played a role. Also, this was the first year that the third grade students were exposed to any state standardized testing environment.

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

Third grade ELA 71%. The transition to a new state evaluation tool and the test being strictly computer based played a role. Also, this was the first year that the third grade students were exposed to any state standardized testing environment.

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.

NONE. All of all categories were above the state and district averages.

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

Fifth grade ELA score had an increase of 12%. Teacher schedules, data chats and student data evaluations, teacher supports, specific focus during PLCs. Additional contributing factors were clear and precise expectations in the classroom, teacher and content collaboration, PD, PLC format, formal and informal evaluations and specific PM monitoring and data chats with teachers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Students with excessive absences and exposure to higher academics.

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

Curriculum fidelity with purpose of outcome in mind.
Time and Classroom structure.
Professional Development and Collaboration.
Specific teaching strategies to achieve desired outcomes.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We evaluated our current third grade 2023 ELA FAST results. This cohort scored lower than previous PES third grade students in past years. It was surprising and uncharacteristic for our school. This baseline cohort dropped 7% from the previous year's cohort.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If all the teachers are consistent in their classroom instruction, implementation of differentiated instruction during Tier 1 and small groups; THEN, PES should see an increase in the proficiency to at least 76%.

Monitoring:

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

I-Ready, Sava instructions, PLC's, small group instruction, DATA chats during PLC's and with Administration, formal and informal observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Stokes (lori.stokes@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The implementation of rigorous content, data evaluation, and specific measurable outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the standard based and rigorous content will have a parallel and measurable evaluation tool to assist the teacher to ensure the students are demonstrating understanding and mastery.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Integrating small group instruction within the classroom with purpose using data to drive groups and content of focus. Professional Development with guest speakers and coaching from the district. Colleagues and coaches modeling lessons to maximize student understanding, PLC's and grade level collaboration and vertical team format.

Person Responsible: Lori Stokes (lori.stokes@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We evaluated our overall FAST Math scores and did relatively well, we did notice a slight dip in two of our cohorts. We need to develop a consistency in the grade level cohorts proficiency data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If all the teachers during their classroom instruction, teach standards based content, differentiate instruction, use formable and intentional small group instruction, THEN, PES should see an overall increase in their math proficiency by at least 3%.

Monitoring:

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

PM data, objective content and standards, parallel evaluation tools that promote rigor, data chats, PLC's, grade level and vertical content discussion, formal and informal evaluation tools, walk throughs, discussing students' work and progress monitoring and discussions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Exposing all students to new grade level and rigorous content, Eureka Squared, and Reveal, should result in students' growth through exposure, scaffolding, and building on previous mathematical foundational skills. This process should establish an understanding of mathematical concepts and how they integrate into new concepts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Additional exposure to Eureka and Eureka Squared curriculum, Integrating small group instruction within the classroom with purpose using data to drive groups and content of focus. Professional Development with guest speakers and coaching from the district. Colleagues and coaches modeling lessons to maximize student understanding, PLC's and grade level collaboration and vertical team format.

Person Responsible: John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Evaluating the PES Climate and Survey and data results. We identified areas of need for improvement based on student responses. An area of focus for PES will be student collaboration and the ability to discuss different opinions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To improve and to establish self awareness and positive peer relations. The objectives were based on the 2023 climate survey results. After integrating various strategies, modeling, guidance lessons and classroom expectations regarding student interactions and discussions, there should be a positive increase to have at least 90% overall student daily attendance based on the 2024 survey data.

Monitoring:

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

PBIS team, Attendance team, Building Resiliency curriculum, character education and Guidance lessons, quarterly attendance to monitor students' attendance, contacting parents, teacher input, SST meetings with all stakeholders and evaluating data to assist in providing resources and interventions to enhance students' understanding and their ability to integrate the positive methods into their school and personal experiences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To expose students to what is and how to achieve positive Self-Awareness, and positive peer relations with individuals. Our goal is to ensure students understand the true meaning of self-awareness, behavior, interactions, and how they impact peer relationships and self-accountability.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To enhance the social and emotional learning of all students at Paterson, and how their self-accountability at school directly impacts their personal success, peer relations, and academic growth.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

To continue to discuss with our instructional and support staff to ensure they are consistently modeling, promoting and teaching these expectations that will reflect on students' self awareness and positive peer relations.

Person Responsible: John O'Brian (john.obrian@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://sbj.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty and staff of S. Bryan Jennings Elementary will collaboratively work with all stakeholders to establish an inclusive, equitable, and safe learning community to support high expectations and maximum achievement in all students by identifying and meeting the unique academic, social, and emotional needs of each individual student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School exists to prepare our scholars to be adult-life ready by forming lifelong learners for success in a competitive global market.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taylor, Mary	Principal	Mrs. Taylor is the instructional leader of the school. She leads the staff as they disaggregate all data sources to identify areas of strength and opportunities to grow. She is responsible for the implementation of all state, district, and school initiatives.
Chapman, Debbie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Chapman is a school administrator responsible for supporting the principal in the instructional leadership of our school, as well as to the overall well-being and safety of the scholars and staff.
Gleneski, Nancy	Reading Coach	Mrs. Gleneski is a Title I reading intervention teacher, as well as the Intervention Team Facilitator. She also leads our school's PBIS committee and serves as our school SAC Chair.
Ruckersfeldt, Jordan	Math Coach	Mrs. Ruckersfeldt leads math interventions, assists with small group practices and data analyses for differentiation, and advances Eureka instruction and implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards. Additionally, she serves as the Title I Lead.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

A School Advisory Council comprised of administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, and community members review and provide input to the School Improvement Plan. Additionally, teachers are made aware of School Improvement Plan goals- which are developed in conjunction with our Title I plan in response to student achievement data- at the start of the new school year in order to provide feedback.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Progress towards SIP goals is monitored through regular School Advisory Council meetings, as well as quarterly data meetings with teachers. During these meetings, student progress towards these goals are analyzed, the status of students who are in most need are discussed, and action steps and resources to close achievement gaps and reach our SIP goals are vetted. If a revision to the SIP is necessary, that revision will be presented to both the School Advisory Council and to teachers and staff for input before a change is made.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	19	24	13	16	15	21	16	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	2	4	6	6	3	5	9	0	0	35
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	18	21	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	12	20	5	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	14	15	22	0	0	55

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	21	16	19	14	16	16	15	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	2	1	10	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	11	9	3	5	9	3	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	3	4	1	6	2	2	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	13	16	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	14	24	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	30	22	40	27	27	0	0	158

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	3	4	8	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	3	6	2	2	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	21	16	19	14	16	16	15	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	2	1	10	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	11	9	3	5	9	3	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	3	4	1	6	2	2	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	13	16	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	14	24	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	30	22	40	27	27	0	0	158

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	3	4	8	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	3	6	2	2	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	51			45			58		
ELA Learning Gains	64			40			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60			22			49		
Math Achievement*	50			47			63		
Math Learning Gains	68			48			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64			52			37		
Science Achievement*	57			46			63		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress				68			75		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	56			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	64	60	50	68	64	57					
SWD	35	54	50	30	54	56	38					
ELL	31	50		13	50							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	70	73	39	65	53	33					
HSP	49	59	40	53	67	75	46					
MUL	54	68		54	74							
PAC												
WHT	59	62		55	71	60	77					
FRL	44	59	63	42	64	61	46					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	45	40	22	47	48	52	46					68
SWD	33	22	9	42	43	45	38					
ELL	28			28								68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	39	27	36	36		33					
HSP	38	42		36	42		33					60
MUL	23	30		42	30							
PAC												
WHT	59	41		62	64		68					
FRL	36	36	18	41	51	50	35					70

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	58	52	49	63	57	37	63					75
SWD	39	48	43	50	47	29	41					
ELL	30	47		45	50		30					75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	45	45	56	49	27	41					
HSP	62	53		54	59	67	70					
MUL	50	42		64	58							
PAC												
WHT	67	59	47	71	62	30	68					
FRL	52	51	56	60	52	35	62					76

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 ELA proficiency is the data component that shows the lowest performance. Though there was growth, 51% to 55%, this was the component that showed the least growth from the previous year. Contributing factors that kept the score from growing more, include an increased population of ELL learners who were non-English speaking which results in a significant learning gap. Students typically have limited access to books, are not frequently read to at home, have minimal background knowledge from exposure to events and experiences outside the home. This is due in large part to the lower socioeconomic demographics of our school population.

The need for additional personnel to help provide more targeted instruction to help close gaps is imperative to our learners. However, this past year, we saw a strain on teacher time and resources needed to meet individual student needs.

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

Though there was no decline, ELA showed the least amount of growth this past year. There was only 4% growth from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023. Contributing factors that kept the score from growing more, include an increased population of ELL learners who were non-English speaking which results in a significant learning gap. Students typically have limited access to books, are not frequently read to at home, have minimal background knowledge from exposure to events and experiences outside the home. This is due in large part to the lower socioeconomic demographics of our school population.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was fifth grade ELA. Our fifth grade ELA average scale score was 313, and the state average scale score was 321. Out of the sixty-seven students who were tested, eight of those students were English Language Learners with very limited English language knowledge and have been in the country for less than two years.

Additionally, eight of these sixty-seven fifth grade students are ESE students. Five of the eight ESE students were new to our school and showed significant gaps in foundational reading skills, which were addressed through intensive Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. Despite the intensive tiered instruction provided to the students they still had significant gaps in foundational reading skills at the end of the year. Historically, our ELA scores over the past few years have been below our district and state average. While great efforts are made each year to bolster whole group and small group instruction and great gains are made, we typically fall short of proficiency. Foundational skills are not solidified; gaps in early years continue to grow as students progress through the grades; and proficiency levels continue to fall below expectations.

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

That data component that showed the most improvement was in Math. Tier 1 instruction using the core curriculum and supplemental programs was provided with fidelity to all students. Explicit small group targeted instruction was provided based on student need. Focused and structured PLC work was

completed with fidelity while continually analyzing student data to determine next steps. Additional support for grade levels was provided for ELL support and additional Title 1 assistance was given.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on the FAST. Another concern is the large number of students presenting with substantial reading deficiencies.

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

1. ELA vocabulary, comprehension/main idea
2. Math - mathematical problem solving and reasoning
3. PBIS - attendance, lessen the number of referrals

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Historically, the students of SBJ have struggled with reading comprehension; more specifically, with vocabulary and reading grade level texts. Students begin the school year one to two grade levels below proficiency. Tremendous gains are made each year, but it is not enough to close these significant achievement gaps. While SBJ has increased its overall proficiency to 55% in 2023 from 51% in 2022, we are still far below our overall proficiency goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By implementing evidence-based strategies to ensure specific student needs are met for proficiency in reading comprehension, we will see a 10% increase in learning gains, from 55% to 65%, in reading comprehension by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through progress monitoring assessments, Lexia Core5 and Lexia Power Up, Savvas assessments, and common formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

SBJ has chosen the following strategies to elevate ELA instruction: small group instruction, explicit vocabulary instruction, an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the five components of reading (Lexia Core5 and Lexia Power Up), direct-explicit instruction, and progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia Core5 is an evidence based program addressing identified gaps in student learning, aligned with the 5 components of reading. The program allows for data driven differentiation closing individual literacy learning gaps and providing explicit instructional opportunities to teachers with lesson components that can be administered in a small group setting. Embedded assessment provides ongoing, actionable data for teachers to prioritize and plan offline instruction. The rationale for the explicit teaching of comprehension skills and explicit vocabulary instruction is that these components can be improved by teaching students to use specific cognitive strategies or to reason strategically when they encounter barriers to understanding what they are reading. Providing focused, intensive, small group interventions for identified students at risk for reading deficiencies including the 5 core reading elements will close learning gaps and improve overall literacy. Progress monitoring will enable teachers to respond to and differentiate instruction based on student needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All ELA teachers will implement daily small group instruction based on student data that will be documented and tracked.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Administration and Title I ELA Coach will select the teachers exhibiting best practices focused on for the monthly look-for's to showcase as model classrooms for walkthroughs and also select 4 teachers that will benefit from observing best practices based upon the monthly walkthrough data cycles.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction & Title I classroom assistants will assist with providing small group instruction cycles in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All teachers will implement explicit vocabulary instruction to increase ELA proficiency through the following: direct instruction of vocabulary words for a specific text and instruction of high frequency vocabulary words that is useful in many contexts.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Administrators will continue to seek professional development opportunities and information through on-going education with FASA and NAESP

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

ELA teachers will utilize Lexia Core 5 and Power Up.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will provide direct and explicit instruction in ELA to improve students' reading comprehension. Comprehension strategies are routines and procedures that readers use to help them make sense of texts. All teachers will focus on comprehension strategies such as, summarizing, asking and answering questions, paraphrasing, and finding the main idea.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Use of smartboards for ELA instruction to increase student engagement within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Title I ELA intervention teacher leading data analysis and small group planning/interventions for ELA as well as model classroom/coaching cycles of best practice replication for teachers identified through walkthrough data completed by administration.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

Data disaggregation and small group planning based on literacy data may occur after school hours as needed.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SBJ students begin the school year one to two grade levels below proficiency in mathematics, with the common trend being that students struggle to apply mathematical skills and concepts to novel situations. Our students have difficulty approaching navigating the problem solving process, which includes choosing appropriate strategies and methods. Tremendous gains are made each year, but it is not enough to close these significant achievement gaps. While SBJ has increased its overall proficiency to 57% in 2023 from % in 2022, we are still far below our overall proficiency goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By demonstrating their understanding of math concepts by explaining or describing problem solving processes and strategies, then SBJ students will improve their overall mathematical proficiency by 8% (from 57% to 65%).

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for desired outcomes through ongoing data analysis of performance monitoring assessments, iReady and ALEKS diagnostics, common formative assessments, and Eureka Squared assessments. This monitoring will indicate when shifts in instructional practice, small group instruction, and/or interventions and enrichment are needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based strategies that will be implemented include small group instruction, progress monitoring, teacher modeling, visual representations, and monitoring and reflecting on the problem solving process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Exposing students to problems that are solved using multiple strategies enables students to become more efficient in selecting appropriate ways to solve math problems with greater ease and flexibility. Explaining relevant concepts and notation in the context of a problem-solving activity, prompting students to describe how worked examples are solved using mathematically valid explanations, and introducing algebraic notation systematically helps students develop new ways of reasoning, which will help them solve mathematical problems. Additionally, visual representations and teacher modeling allow students who have difficulty grasping the relationship between math representations and abstract symbols to understand this across math concepts and ideas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction. To support small group instruction in classrooms, The Title I Intervention teacher leading data analysis and small group planning/interventions for math as well as model classroom/coaching cycles of best practice replication. Additionally, Title I classroom assistants will assist with providing small group instruction cycles in classrooms .

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Using chromebooks and headphones to support the technology based supplemental programs to our core instruction and assist with quarterly progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Administration and Title I Math Coach will select the teachers exhibiting best practices focused on for the monthly look-for's to showcase as model classrooms for walkthroughs and also select 4 teachers that will benefit from observing best practices based upon the monthly walkthrough data cycles.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

Using chromebooks and headphones to support the technology based supplemental programs to our core instruction assist with quarterly progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Professional development for teachers and staff on problem solving, mathematical thinking and reasoning standards (MTRs), and discourse in the mathematics classroom to build teacher and student capacity for monitoring and reflecting on problem solving processes.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

All teachers will implement modeling by having students use appropriate tools to create concrete visual representations as evident in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work analysis in PLCs. Additional manipulatives and notebooks for interactive note taking during whole group and small group instruction will assist with students learning to master mathematical concepts with visual representations.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Title I Math intervention teacher leading data analysis and small group planning/interventions for Math as well as model classroom/coaching cycles of best practice replication for teachers identified through classroom walkthrough data from administration.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

All teachers will implement modeling by having students use appropriate tools to create concrete visual representations as evident in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work analysis in PLCs. Additional manipulatives and notebooks for interactive note taking during whole group and small group instruction will assist with students learning to master mathematical concepts with visual representations.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Professional development centered around the book: Visual Learning for Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although SBJ implements a positive behavior system with high student and teacher buy in, the number of discipline referrals nearly doubled from in 2022 to 78 in 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using actions and strategies related to student engagement and the continued implementation of our PBIS program, we will decrease our overall number of referrals from 78 to 40 or less by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored with a PBIS monthly newsletter to faculty and staff, and Synergy reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based interventions that will be implemented for this area of focus include engaging students in relevant learning, defining and teaching positive expectations, prompting and supervising skills, and creating and providing a continuum of response strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We already have an established and successful PBIS program at our school. The rationale of the selection of these evidence-based strategies is that we want to expand upon our current success, and amplify those positive practices already in place. Furthermore, the selection of these strategies will assist our students in transferring the positive behavior skills and life skills instilled in them at school into other facets of their lives, which will contribute to them being successful beyond the classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Actively engage students (provide high rates of varied opportunities to respond) in relevant learning and differentiate instruction to support all learners. 7 Mindsets mini booklets for new staff to receive along with initial PBIS training.

Person Responsible: Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Co-develop, define, posit, and explicitly teach a few (3-5) positive classroom expectations to enhance engagement. (PAWS-practice responsibility, act kind & respectful, work hard, & stay safe). book: Safe Circles from the 7 Mindsets store to be implemented after PD provided on specific life skill engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter

Weekly publications to parents through Smore and additional productions for students with Canva & SmartSuite.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Parent communication folders that are used to send home weekly communications, such as announcements, grades, conference requests, and data reports. Paper (pallet) for messaging of important events and provision of at-home resources. Poster maker paper, toner, and ink or consistent messaging and signage around campus displaying our PAWS expectations-especially the entry and exit of campus. Poster maker paper, toner, and ink or consistent messaging and signage around campus displaying our PAWS expectations-especially the entry and exit of campus.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Schoolwide signs displaying consistent messaging.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: As needed

Continue implementation of PBIS with specific enhancements to further differentiation the needs of all our learners to include students with disabilities and English language learners.

Person Responsible: Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Only 24% of ELL students were at or above proficiency on the 2023 FAST ELA assessment by the third progress monitoring assessment. Additionally, ACCESS testing indicates 11% of our ELL students show language proficiency, as indicated by their overall composite scores.

Measurable Outcome:

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

40% of ELL students will show proficiency by the end of year FAST assessment raising proficiency levels by 16%. With increased usage of Imagine Learning, we should expect to see the percentage of students increasing their overall composite scores from the previous year. ACCESS test scores and overall proficiency levels will rise 10%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focused will be monitored for the desired outcome through classroom walkthroughs, quarterly data reviews, monthly Literacy Leadership Team data reviews, weekly monitoring of Imagine Learning usage, and FAST assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

There are three evidence-based interventions that will be used for this area of focus. Small group instruction provided with the assistance of ELL classroom assistants to target data indicated areas of need and increase proficiency. Professional development opportunities to facilitate and assist language immersion and learning provided by the district ESOL department and school. ELL dictionaries for scholars to access and utilize as they work towards fluency of language and content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction. Small group instruction is a promising strategy. Collective efficacy provided through professional development is ranked as the number one factor influencing student achievement. Ensuring students know how to utilize ELL dictionaries are a way to explicitly teach vocabulary. The National Reading Panel (NRP) stated that vocabulary plays an important role both in learning to read and in comprehending text: readers cannot understand text without knowing what most of the words mean.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional development opportunities on best practices for working with ELL students and monitoring program usage of Imagine learning.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: As needed

Weekly usage monitoring of the Imagine Learning program to ensure all students meet the 60 minutes per week requirement.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Data is deeply disaggregated on a monthly basis by sub groups and standards due to the rise of various sub group populations over the recent years, such as English Language Learners and students with identified learning disabilities. Title I funds are utilized to ensure we are allocating funded personnel to support intentional small group instruction that is data driven to close learning gaps in foundational skills and leverage learning outcomes. Based upon recent data discussions, an additional teaching assistant allocation was added for the year. Positions are frequently adjusted based upon student data and the needs indicated for support. The way funds, personnel, and resources are allocated are utilized is also discussed at School Advisory Council meetings with teachers, support, parents, and community members to glean useful insight from all stakeholders in the education process.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST data, Kindergarten was 42% below proficiency, 1st grade was 42% below proficiency, and 2nd grade was 47% below proficiency.

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

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST data, third grade had 49% of students below proficiency and fourth grade had 31% below proficiency. Fifth grade had 52% of students performing below proficiency scoring a level 1 and level 2 in ELA.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST data, less than 50% of students in K-2 were below proficiency. Our goal for 2024 will be to reduce this number by the end of the year and close foundational gaps so that only 10% of these students are below proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST data, the 5th grade student cohort was of particular concern with only 48% proficiency. Our goal for 2024 PM 3 is for 60% of 5th grade students to show proficiency, which will elevate 3-5 ELA proficiency to 65% proficiency.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly PLCs

Quarterly data meetings

Classroom Walkthroughs

Lexia Core 5 and weekly data reviews

FAST Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

SRA Decoding and Comprehension are provided through direct explicit instruction as interventions to close instructional gaps.

Weekly PLCs to create common formative assessments, analyze student data, and refine instructional practices are consistent and collaborative.

Small group differentiated instruction based on individual student indicated needs closes gaps to leverage proficiency.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

PLCs improve instructional practices and leverage student achievement. Data reviews increase the effectiveness of small group and differentiation practices to individualize student learning based upon need. Small group instruction provides focused, intensive interventions for identified students at risk for reading deficiencies to close learning gaps and elevate proficiency levels.

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
<p>Professional Learning and Assessment- Teachers are utilizing district ELA supports through weekly PLCs specifically focusing on creating common formative assessments for all ELA classrooms. The assessments are built based upon standards and then student data is analyzed using the TACA protocol to determined mastery and next steps for instruction among the team.</p>	<p>Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership and Literacy Coaching- ELA teachers are provided professional development on the science of reading and specific county based interventions (such as SRA Decoding and Comprehension) that support direct, explicit, systematic instruction to leverage student learning outcomes. The progress made by students receiving these interventions for significant reading deficiencies is reviewed on at least a monthly basis by our school Literacy Leadership Team to ensure progress is made and determine next steps and suggestions for teams.</p>	<p>Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching and Professional Learning- Teachers will participate in cycles of model classroom walkthroughs to view best practice instruction that can be replicated throughout campus. They will have time set aside to discuss and debrief after viewing the instructional practices and plan prior to returning for implementation in their classrooms.</p>	<p>Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school disseminates the school improvement plan during our initial School Advisory Council meeting of the new school year. The SAC revisits the SIP throughout the year to monitor progress towards goals. Additionally, the SIP is shared during the annual Title I parent meeting, which is held in conjunction with

the school's Open House. The information in this meeting is shared digitally for families who cannot attend in person. A paper copy of the SIP can be found in the front office in the school's Title I binder. A digital copy of the SIP is available via the school's webpage, under the Title I Resources tab: <https://sbj.myoneclay.net/>.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Much like the School Improvement Plan, the school's Family Engagement Plan is disseminated in a variety of methods to ensure everyone has access to it. The plan is shared and monitored throughout the year at School Advisory Council meetings; it is shared at the annual Title I parent meeting; and it is shared in the Title I binder in the front office. A digital copy of the Family Engagement Plan is available via the school's webpage, under the Title I Resources tab: <https://sbj.myoneclay.net/>.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school through the achievement of the ELA, Math, PBIS, and ESSA goals outlined in this School Improvement Plan. By incorporating a variety of action steps, teaching strategies, and professional development opportunities, our teachers will have a higher capacity for providing an enriched and accelerated curriculum. The three main components of this plan are strong Professional Learning Communities, the implementation of monthly teacher observation cycles, and the monthly meetings of our PBIS and Literacy Leadership committees. These components will ensure that teachers are implementing action steps with fidelity, and that student progress is being monitored carefully and responded to accordingly to ensure maximum growth.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan was not developed in coordination or integration with other Federal, State, or local services.

Clay County Schools

Shadowlawn Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Shadowlawn Elementary School

2945 COUNTY ROAD 218, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://sle.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Shadowlawn Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Shadowlawn Elementary's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, Whitney	Principal	The duties of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction of all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-6 iReady Math diagnostic, 4-6 Achieve 3000 data, FAST data (PM1, PM2, PM3) and data from Lexia. The principal leads the meetings and provides a common vision for members in order to make data informed decisions.
Padgett, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 supports
Montoro, Bianca	Assistant Principal	The duties of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction of all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-6 iReady Math diagnostic, 4-6 Achieve 3000 data, FAST data (PM1, PM2, PM3) and data from Lexia. The principal leads the meetings and provides a common vision for members in order to make data informed decisions.
Parker, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 supports
Hager, Josh	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 supports
Studer, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	The Chair of the SAC committee shall assist the principal in leading the committee an assist in developing the SIP.
Cyrus, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 supports
Adair, Kim	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 supports
Hillis, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 supports
Perez, Mabel	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 supports

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Shadowlawn Elementary uses their School Advisory Council to involve stakeholders in the development of the SIP. The School Advisory Council is composed of elected teachers, support staff, parents and community partners.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored by the Leadership team to ensure goals are continuing to be met. Teachers and staff across the school will be working together to make the improvements needed to meet goals. Information will be shared with stakeholders at regular SAC (School Advisory Council) meetings.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	21%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	

School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	26	20	20	12	15	12	22	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	6	4	2	6	0	0	32
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	9	6	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	16	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	8	1	1	0	5	9	11	0	0	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	40	40	29	20	21	26	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	14	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	27	17	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	8	11	14	0	0	33

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	40	40	29	20	21	26	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	14	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	27	17	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	8	11	14	0	0	33

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	8	1	1	0	5	9	11	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67			63			68		
ELA Learning Gains	58			44			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44			42			60		
Math Achievement*	76			71			74		
Math Learning Gains	64			51			74		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55			38			71		
Science Achievement*	60			63			60		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	424
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	49			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	68			
HSP	55			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	56			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	58	44	76	64	55	60					
SWD	47	44	44	61	53	60	32					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	55		80	82							
HSP	53	76		57	55	50	36					
MUL	50			60								
PAC												
WHT	69	57	43	78	65	53	65					
FRL	62	52	40	71	60	55	55					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	44	42	71	51	38	63					
SWD	41	27	35	50	33	20	42					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58	54		68	46							
HSP	50	64		59	80							
MUL	57			57								
PAC												
WHT	65	42	47	73	49	34	65					
FRL	56	36	42	63	46	39	40					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	63	60	74	74	71	60					
SWD	45	50	60	54	69	70	35					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	52	58		74	84							
HSP	71	70		79	80							
MUL	58	53		63	73							
PAC												
WHT	69	63	61	74	72	70	59					
FRL	55	54	58	67	69	71	46					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

During the 2022 school year, our overall lowest 25th percentile

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

During the 2022 school year, our bottom 25th percentile students performed with only 44% making learning gains. Factors contributing to their performance include the increased discipline infractions, attendance, and small group intervention effectiveness.

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.

Shadowlawn outperformed the District and the State in our greatest area of deficiency: ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%.

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

Shadowlawn increased by 16 points in overall 5th grade science proficiency meeting out previous year’s SIP goal.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The greatest EWS concern for the 2022 school year was attendance.

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

1. Increase Overall 5th Grade ELA Scores
2. Increase Bottom Quartile Learning Gains
3. Increase Overall Learning Gains
4. Increase Overall ELA Proficiency
5. Increase & Maintain 5th Grade Science and Math Achievement Levels

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Due to the lower area of ELA across grades 3-6, Shadowlawn will focus on the protocol based literacy strategies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Shadowlawn will increase by 3 percentage points to show gains from 67% to 70% proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored through district level benchmarks and FAST testing windows to ensure student growth is occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The interventions that will be implemented will be Corrective Reading and Spelling through Morphology. This will be in addition to the TIER 1 instruction of reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to have a strong reading foundation so they are able to be proficient readers in order to be college and/or career ready.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Inservice for teachers who teach ELA with a focus on standards-based instruction.
2. Vertical team meetings with grade levels above and below to ensure academic vocabulary is consistent and students are prepared for next grade level and are building upon foundations.
3. Monthly data chats to discuss the progress of students.

Person Responsible: Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

By When: These action steps will be address monthly, quarterly and yearly or as needed for expected growth.

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on our recent data, SWD students are still struggling to perform at the proficiency levels of their non-disabled peers. We are still seeing impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic which shows that students were missing many foundational skills needed for proficiency and our SWD are requiring more individualized instruction techniques through differentiations to close gaps and and meet their individual needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD students will regain ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gain Levels and will increase by 18% from 42% to 60% using our 2021-2022 FSA data.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will be completed using the Lexia diagnostic and the FAST progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Shadowlawn will utilize the Lexia Skill Builder Lessons, Heggerty Bridge the Gap, Corrective Reading and Spelling Through Morphology to differentiate instruction through product, process, and content based on the student's instructional profiles and need provided by a fluid progress monitoring standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to learning gaps in our SWD, students will require individualized instruction to meet their individual needs in ELA.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Monthly data chats to progress monitor the achievement levels and areas of opportunity for our SWD population.
2. Attend weekly ESE team Professional Learning Communities to plan for student differentiation.
3. Utilize the Iready teacher toolbox for differentiated curriculum.

Person Responsible: Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

By When: Action steps will be monitored and tracked weekly, monthly and yearly or as needed to see expected growth among SWD students.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If all teachers implement the Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports with fidelity and high expectations, then student's will develop self- awareness, self- management, social and relationship skills and responsible decision making abilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we implement Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports to address Behavior, we would like to see a decrease in referrals from 251 down to 125-130 which would indicate a decrease of at least 50%.

Monitoring:

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

The 7 Mindsets provide targeted Social Emotional Learning for students which addresses social situations and expectations for pro-social interaction. Each month we will tackle a different characterisitic for Social Emotional Learning (SEL) development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The schedule we will follow when teachign lessons to implement positive SEL in students was developed by Clay County and is aligned to the character ed crosswalk. These include:

October: 100% accountable

November/ December- Attitude of Gratitude

January- We Are Connected

February- Live to Give

March- Everything is Possible

April- Passion First

May- The Time is Now

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In an effort to meet the social emotional, mental and behavioral needs of students and staff, an SEL team will be implemented. Our measurable outcomes will be addressed via a decrease in the number of discipline referrals.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Establish the SLE 7 Mindsets Team.
2. Attend monthly mindsets school-based Professional Learning Communities.
3. Follow the district crosswalk for mindsets.
4. Implement school-wide PBIS program.

Person Responsible: Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

By When: Daily implementation of PBIS program, monthly PLC's based on SEL and yearly implementation of 7 mindsets program.

Clay County Schools

Spring Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	11
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Spring Park Elementary

3530 COUNTY ROAD 315, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<https://sps.myoneclay.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to create the foundation for literate, productive members of society. Spring Park Elementary, working collaboratively with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Our teachers will provide rigorous and relevant learning opportunities for each child to experience academic and social success within a safe and inviting environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Spring Park Elementary exists to prepare lifelong learners for personal success in a global and a diverse society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Outman, Tiffany	Principal	The principal is responsible for ensuring quality instruction in the school, ensuring facilities and operations are in order, recruit and retain highly effective faculty and staff, building the culture of the school and ensuring that financial rules, procedures, and regulations are followed with fidelity.
Caricato, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Providing instructional leadership, providing PD to teachers based on data and needs, and working collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure high levels of instruction. Responsible for tracking and implementing safety drills, Responding to student discipline issues, and other operational functions of the school.
Love, Angela	Other	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Since we are a new school we are collaborating with all stakeholders to create improvement goals based on our first progress monitoring assessments and formation of our school wide PBIS system. This collaboration will happen through our School Advisory Council meetings.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our School Improvement Plan will be revised as needed through our School Based Leadership Team meetings as well as our School Advisory Council meetings. We will revisit our goals after each assessment period.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	0%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	0%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*									
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*									
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*									
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
 The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 PM1 Math data shows the lowest performance with only 18% of scholars showing proficiency. This is our first year in existence so we have no historical data to compare.

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

N/A

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.

Our math data shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

N/A

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

N/A

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

Our highest priority is to implement a successful PBIS system so that teachers, staff and scholars are respected creating a collaborative, rigorous, engaging learning environment where scholars are able to increase their reading and math achievement to proficiency or beyond.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Opening a new school with children from multiple surrounding schools is quite a challenge. We have found within our first month how badly a school wide PBIS system is needed. Scholars are unsure of our behavioral expectations after a month of teaching them. We will work together as a staff to create a positive, cohesive learning environment where all scholars are recognized for their positive contribution to our learning community.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At Spring Park Elementary our goal is that 100% of scholars will be recognized for positive behavior choices.

Monitoring:

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

Scholars receiving a specified amount of tally marks or less (depending on the specific behavior goal of each student) will earn classroom rewards designated by the teacher. Those students will also have the opportunity to earn lunch with the principal or lunch in a specially designated area each month. Students will have the opportunity to earn back tally marks if undesirable behavior is changed for a more desirable behavior.

Teachers will keep track of points in their classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

School Wide PBIS system that is in development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

At Spring Park Elementary we are striving to "work hard, be kind and be our best at SPS". This includes in the classroom and around the campus. Spring Park Elementary strives to raise up student leaders committed to kindness and inclusivity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create and implement a strong school wide PBIS system through professional development with teachers and staff.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)

By When: October

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Since this is our first year in existence and our second year with the math BEST standards, our focus needs to be on using the systems we are putting into place to improve our instructional practice with the new standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SPS plans to achieve an increase of 50 percentage points going from 18% to 68% proficiency by PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will use iReady math and teacher based assessments to monitor the progress of our scholars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which include iReady.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of math. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include Eureka and iReady math.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach BEST Math standards with the grade level expectation of rigor. Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Since this is our first year in existence and the third year for ELA BEST standards, our focus needs to be on using the systems we are establishing to improve our instructional practice with the new standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SPS plans to achieve an increase of 30 percentage points with these scholars for ELA going from 39% to 69% showing proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

We will use Lexia, PM 2 and teacher based assessments to monitor the progress of our scholars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Caricato (michelle.caricato@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based strategies that we will implement are the use of small group instruction and remediation, as well as the use of effective, district adopted materials which include SAVAAS, and Lexia Core 5

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With increased rigor and the implementation of grade level appropriate materials our students will show improvement in the area of ELA. The resources that we will implement are the skill set of highly effective teachers in addition to the use of district adopted materials which include SAVAAS, and Lexia Core 5.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional development for teachers in the area of using the curriculum to teach BEST ELA standards with the grade level expectation of rigor. Professional development in the area of student academic ownership using learning targets and measurable criteria.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Outman (tiffany.outman@myoneclay.net)

By When: May 2024

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

1630 WOODPECKER LN, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://spc.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary is committed to working collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide students with an educational experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to empower students by providing an innovative and engaging learning environment that prepares them for future success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Larson, Cheryl	Principal	Oversees all school initiatives
Nebesnyk, Heidi	Teacher, ESE	SAC chair and serves our struggling and ESE students
Davis, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Leads PLC team and is part of our school literacy and problem solving team
Dryden, Katherine	Instructional Media	Serves as our Instructional Application Facilitator
Heitman, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	Leads PLC team and is part of our school literacy and problem solving team
Maly, Kelly	Teacher, PreK	Leads PLC team and is part of our school literacy and problem solving team
Mills, Katlyn	Teacher, ESE	Serves as our Intervention Team Facilitator
McCord, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Leads PLC team and is part of our school literacy and problem solving team
Ohlendorf, Faith	Teacher, K-12	Leads PLC team and is part of our school literacy and problem solving team
Paternoster, Dawn	Teacher, ESE	Leads PLC team and is part of our school literacy and problem solving team
Smith, Laura	Assistant Principal	Assists in overseeing school initiatives

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our school improvement plan has been created based on multiple sources of data and stakeholder input and vetted through our leadership team.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our SAC team will meet quarterly to review data and refine the plan in order to achieve our goals in meeting the State's academic standards. We will be highly focused on our students with disabilities to ensure growth is occurring.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	15	15	7	18	15	15	6	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	10	17	19	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	15	16	23	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	10	12	15	0	0	40

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	32	10	16	14	12	10	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	4	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	12	5	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	0	0	2	15	18	4	0	0	43

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	2	15	18	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	32	10	16	14	12	10	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	4	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	12	5	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	0	0	2	15	18	4	0	0	43

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	2	15	18	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61			70			63		
ELA Learning Gains	61			75			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			53			64		
Math Achievement*	64			72			63		
Math Learning Gains	65			62			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57			76			49		
Science Achievement*	75			74			71		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	57			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	61	53	64	65	57	75					
SWD	29	43	45	22	42	50						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	63		31	44							
HSP	56	60		52	60							
MUL	63	40		63	60							
PAC												
WHT	64	63	56	70	69	69	73					
FRL	52	52	44	56	56	41	76					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	75	53	72	62	76	74					
SWD	36	53	54	50	76	73	46					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			58								
HSP	73	90		59	50							
MUL	72			78								
PAC												
WHT	74	77	50	77	60		81					
FRL	63	77		68	55		74					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	67	64	63	62	49	71					
SWD	48	63	57	49	59	43	50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	64	30	57	64		70					
HSP	64	72		58	63	55	58					
MUL	65	71		60	71							
PAC												
WHT	65	67	68	67	61	44	75					
FRL	54	56	57	56	56	48	61					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 performance was in the following grade levels: 4th ELA with 47% proficiency; 5th ELA with 44% proficiency; 5th Math with 37% proficiency. Our SWD were under 50% proficient with 5th grade being the lowest. There are a large population of SWD in our 4-6 grade students who have historically performed below grade level.

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

Our 5th grade students demonstrated a significant decline in proficiency. Behaviors have contributed to the academic deficiency.

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.

Based on our progress monitoring data and state assessment data, our 4th and 5th ELA proficiency, especially with our subgroup SWD, has the greatest gap compared with the state. Attendance and behavior are 2 contributing factors that have impacted proficiency.

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

Our Math proficiency, especially in 6th grade showed the most improvement. The 6th grade math teacher has high engagement and uses our PBIS model in his classroom.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our main area of concern is attendance which negatively impacts proficiency.

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

- Continue strengthening attendance through monthly attendance meetings and scheduled Success Team meetings with families.
- Continue strengthening our PBIS/ trauma-informed approach to improve home-school relationships, which will improve attendance, behavior and academics
- Increase collaboration between general education teachers and support facilitators through collaborative planning bi-weekly in the master schedule.
- Success Block for grades 4-6 that target specific area of need in ELA (intervention/enrichment) that is provided daily and is part of the master schedule. These groups are fluid based on progress monitoring.
- Support PLC work to strengthen core instruction
- Provide monthly (at minimum) supports (through school and district) for teachers new to grade level, school or county. District coaches are provided to new teachers to support curriculum and management.
- Regular data meetings held to analyze student data and provide necessary supports

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Deepen standards based academic instruction to increase ELA proficiency. We will focus on intentional planning for explicit instruction to increase student achievement in overall proficiency because over the past 2 years proficiency scores have declined, especially our SWD. Small group instruction will be tailored to students' needs with an emphasis on essential standards. Through collaborative planning, we will target our subgroup (SWD) and meet monthly to monitor that adequate progress is happening for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In May, 2023 26% of our 3-6 grade SWD scored proficient on the ELA FAST PM3. By May, 2024 41% of 3-6 grade SWD will demonstrate proficiency on the ELA FAST PM3. The students scoring below proficiency will make a minimum of a 10 point gain from ELA FAST PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Academic proficiency will be monitored through the following:

- monthly MTSS meetings - teachers/ ESE/ ITF
- FAST PM data - teacher/ admin
- Student Success Binders - student track their own data (Lexia, Intervention/ Enrichment progress monitoring, classroom performance)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We have implemented a schoolwide Success Block that is on the master schedule daily for 4-6 grade students. Diagnostic data was used to place students in a targeted intervention/ enrichment group to address the area of need in ELA. District adopted evidence-based material is used for each group including Corrective Reading for students in need of interventions. SWD have been strategically placed in smaller groups, and this time is in addition to the services received by their support facilitator. Our SWD that are served in a self-contained setting are receiving this intervention with their non-disabled peers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on cubed assessment and corrective reading placement tests, students are receiving specially designed instruction to meet their are of need.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Diagnostic and placement tests given to all 4-6 grade students to provide targeted instruction and create groups based on students' needs. All ESE, general education teachers and trained paras are assigned a group based and specific district approved material that addresses area of need. The Success Block is scheduled in the master calendar daily and is sacred time to close gaps and enrich learners.

Person Responsible: Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

By When: Complete by August 18 to begin Success Block on August 21; new students should be placed within 2 school days

General education teacher and support facilitator meet for collaborative planning bi-weekly for 40 minutes as part of the master schedule.

Person Responsible: Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

By When: The schedule begins the first full week of school

Monthly MTSS meetings are planned on the meeting matrix to progress monitor students identified as having a substantial reading deficit between the general education teachers, ESE teachers and Intervention Team Facilitator.

Person Responsible: Katlyn Mills (katlyn.mills@myoneclay.net)

By When: Second Wednesday of each month

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Deepen standards based academic instruction to increase ELA proficiency. We will focus on intentional planning for explicit instruction to increase student achievement in overall proficiency because over the past 2 years proficiency scores have declined. Small group instruction will be tailored to students' needs with an emphasis on essential standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In May, 2023 51.91% of 3-6 grade students scored proficient on the ELA FAST PM3. By May, 2024 61% of 3-6 grade students will demonstrated proficiency on the ELA FAST PM3. The students scoring below proficiency will make a 10 point gain at minimum from ELA FAST PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly MTSS meetings for student identified with a substantial deficiency in Reading - Teachers/ ESE/ ITF

FAST PM and Lexia data meetings - teacher/ admin

Student Success binders - students track their own data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Learning communities focus on strengthening tier 1 instruction and choose essential standards to track mastery of prerequisite skills through vertical teams. Administration and district specialists will support the work in PLC and promote high leverage practices. Professional development will be provided based on needs of students and teachers according to data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By systematically designing instruction toward specific learning goals, teachers build capacity and are more equipped to close learning gaps with students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A plan for PLC was created over the summer with input from teacher leaders. Weekly meeting times are non-negotiable and expectations of participation were shared with faculty during pre-planning. Teachers have the year at a glance plan with the understanding that revisions could be made based on data and

stakeholder input. Administration is working with district specialists to support teachers in their professional learning communities.

Person Responsible: Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

By When: Dedicated time for work in PLC on the meeting matrix each Thursday from 7:30-8:15

Learning walkthroughs will be conducted by administration on a regular basis to ensure that high-leverage strategies are being used in classrooms and the data from these will be discussed in faculty meetings as well as individual conferences with teachers. During whole group PLC work, administration will model engagement strategies while sharing walk through data and conveying expectations for strong instruction that is aligned with and meets rigor of BEST standards. The administration team has a system to ensure that all teachers receive feedback at a minimum of two times a month. The administration team meets weekly to calibrate feedback and determine next steps for support of teachers and students.

Person Responsible: Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If we increase student engagement and investment in learning through the use of a schoolwide positive behavior support program with a trauma informed approach, our overall attendance will improve. Having a common language across the campus will positively impact school culture, which is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. Based on our 2023 Climate Survey, our greatest area of need for both student and school based personnel was Class Management, which demonstrates a need for a consistent, systematic plan. We will continue to strengthen the implementation of our current PBIS plan to include a safe place in each classroom to allow a student to de-escalate. We also have scheduled training in trauma informed practices that help faculty understand the brain states and regulation strategies. All students with 2 or more Early Warning Indicators attended below 90% of the year. Students who feel safe in their learning environments will have a desire to come to school each day.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In May, 2023 our overall attendance average for k-6 students was 86.98%. By May, 2024 our average attendance for K-6 students will be 96%.

Monitoring:

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

Our attendance team, which includes administration, school counselor and social worker, meets each month to analyze attendance data and schedule Success Team Meetings that include the teachers and academic data. The MTSS monthly meetings will also address attendance as we communicate progress monitoring data with families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

An attendance system has been implemented so that the first communication comes from the teacher after an absence so that a discussion regarding the impact on academics occurs. After repeated absences the teacher completes a social work referral providing anecdotal information about the child. At the attendance meetings, the team reaches out to the families to share concerns and schedule a Success Team Meeting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The meetings are designed to remove barriers to attendance for students at risk and partner with families to improve

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 deepen understanding of learning and human development to create a safe and respectful learning environment. Otter Values lessons will be given at the beginning of the year and throughout the the year as needed to coach on school expectations. Monthly Otter Values Team meetings are held to analyze discipline. Conscious Discipline strategies/ videos will be provided to faculty in a weekly newsletter as well as professional development on brain research and regulation strategies.

Person Responsible: Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly on going throughout the school year

We are creating a culture in which all teachers and staff purposefully develop relationships with students and their families in order to create a sense of belonging on campus. Parent education will be provided throughout the year to strengthen the school-home partnership.

Person Responsible: Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly family newsletters and ongoing family engagement activities

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

We have 4 allocations for ESE Inclusion teachers. There roles are as followed:

Teacher 1 - Montessori classes and Intervention Team Facilitator for the school

Teacher 2 - Kindergarten, 1st and 4th grades

Teacher 3 - 2nd and 5th

Teacher 4 - 3rd and 6th

Our ESE Inclusion teachers lead our schoolwide initiative to provide targeted ELA instruction to all 4-6 grade students. They assessed students and provided each group materials that addressed areas of need or enrichment. They meet with administration to design tools for progress monitoring so that the groups can be flexible based on data. All ESE teachers have a small intervention group and implement SDI with our SWD during our Success Block daily. In addition, our SWD are served through support facilitation in the general education setting. The ESE teachers also facilitate the collaborative planning with their general education teachers bi-weekly.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

N/A

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

ELA proficiency in 4th and 5th grade are below 50% and SWD ELA proficiency was below 50% in 3-6 grades

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In May, 2023 51.91% of 3-6 grade students scored proficient on the ELA FAST PM3. By May, 2024 61% of 3-6 grade students will demonstrated proficiency on the ELA FAST PM3.

In May, 2023 27% of SWD in 3-6 grade scored proficient on the ELA FAST PM3. By May, 2024 41% of SWD in 3-6 grade will demonstrated proficiency on the ELA FAST PM3.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Our teams will meet monthly at a minimum with administration to analyze data and refine plan to ensure learning gaps are closing, especially for our SWD.

MTSS/ Attendance Meeting - 2nd Wednesday of each month

Collaborative planning with ESE Inclusion teacher and general education teacher - biweekly schedule

PLC meets weekly Thursday 7:30-8:15

Otter Values Team - 2nd Friday of each month

New Teacher Support - 2nd Tuesday of each month

Literacy Team Meeting - 4th Tuesday of each month

ESE team meeting w/ Administration - 1st Friday of each month

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Larson, Cheryl, cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Success Block - Intervention material: Corrective Reading, Enrichment: Simple Rigor strategy

Implementing tier 1 district approved materials with fidelity

4th grade - tier 1 includes Spelling Through Morphology

Use data and decision tree to drive instruction

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Intervention materials were selected based on Cube-Assessments and Corrective Reading Placement tests.

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
Literacy Coaching - Utilize district specialists to support PLC work Secured new teacher coaches for our 2 new teachers Secured coaches for teachers new to school/ grade level	Larson, Cheryl, cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net
Assessment: ESE Inclusion teachers will develop a system to track progress with Success Block for students to keep in their Success Binders. They will also train teachers and paras to assess students using Acadiance.	Larson, Cheryl, cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Information will be shared at Open House, SAC meetings and the information will be available on our website as well as a link in our family newsletter.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

SPC fosters positive family relationships through ongoing engagement activities during and after school throughout the year. Activities such as fun Run/ Walk events, flagpole ceremonies, family nights, Chorus events and the family picnic are ways we positively connect to the community. We also have an active parent volunteer organization that supports learning on campus through various tasks. The

implementation of the Conscious Discipline approach is communicated to all stakeholders through a monthly newsletter to strengthen the home-school connection. A weekly Tuesday folder is sent home to keep families up to date with classroom performance and monthly progress monitoring is communicated when students are receiving academic or behavior interventions.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our Success Block is a schoolwide initiative that addresses proficiency for all students. Instructional time is protected and the expectation is for teaching to occur from bell to bell. Collaborative planning is part of the master schedule to ensure our ESE and general education teachers have time to plan for targeted instruction for SWD.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school counselor provides monthly resiliency based lessons to all homeroom classes. In addition, she teaches the required 360 Suite lessons. Our school counselor, Mental Health Counselor and our Military Family Life Counselor coordinate a variety of small groups weekly based on student needs. Teachers have been trained and have access to referral forms for our school counselor and our social worker. Students with behavioral needs on their IEP also receive individual counseling services with our Mental Health Counselor.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A - Our school counselor does provide transition activities for our 6th grade students to prepare them for junior high. This includes schedule planning where students are picking electives based on anticipated post-secondary career paths.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our PBIS program is called Otter Values. All students receive tier 1 instruction targeted around the values of being peaceful, responsible and safe. Lessons are provided to teach expectations across all school settings.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

All our first year teachers and teachers new to the school participate in monthly professional development opportunities focused on meeting teacher needs based on survey results. These meetings will lead to an increase in teacher retention. Additionally, identified teachers receive targeted and intentional support coaching utilizing district supports.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our preschool Montessori program provides students early access to the school environment and community. We partner with the community to host a kindergarten round up in the Spring where rising kindergarteners are able to tour the school and participate in classroom activities. Families receive kindergarten readiness materials to work with students at home. In the summer kindergartners are invited for individual screening sessions and another school tour to familiarize them with our school.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No

Clay County Schools

Thunderbolt Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	13
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Thunderbolt Elementary School

2020 THUNDERBOLT RD, Fleming Island, FL 32003

<http://tbe.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission statement of Thunderbolt Elementary is to provide a safe academic environment in which children and staff are encouraged to strive for excellence in scholarship and sociability while showing respect for themselves and others.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Thunderbolt Elementary prepares life-long learners to attain academic and applicable life skills that lead to success in a global and competitive workplace.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bathurst, Amy	Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing, and communications with parents, students, and teachers. -Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. -Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. -Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and ensure proper security, maintenance, and cleanliness of the campus. -Responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. -Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. -Responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. -Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County District Schools Code of Student Conduct. -Responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. -Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. -Provide a safe learning environment through the preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc. -Responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations -Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. -Responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. -Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment, and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. -Serve on district-wide committees when requested. -Responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. -Responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. -Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to the school. -Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. -Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Writes, Florida -Comprehensive Assessment Test, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement.-Communicate

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students, and the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. -Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals, or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. -Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. -Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.
Finely, Tracey	Assistant Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing, and communications with parents, students, and teachers. -Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. -Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. -Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and ensure proper security, maintenance, and cleanliness of the campus. -Responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. -Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. -Responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. -Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County District Schools Code of Student Conduct. -Responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. -Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. -Provide a safe learning environment through the preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc. -Responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations -Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. -Responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. -Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment, and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students.-Serve on

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Jeffrey	Assistant Principal	<p>district-wide committees when requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. -Responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. -Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to the school. -Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. -Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Writes, Florida -Comprehensive Assessment Test, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. -Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students, and the community. -Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. -Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals, or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. -Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. -Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position. <p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing, and communications with parents, students, and teachers. -Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. -Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. -Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and ensure proper security, maintenance, and cleanliness of the campus. -Responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. -Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. -Responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. -Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County District Schools Code of Student Conduct. -Responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering mastercontracts.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. -Provide a safe learning environment through the preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc. -Responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations -Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. -Responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. -Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment, and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. -Serve on district-wide committees when requested. -Responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. -Responsible for the performance of all personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. -Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to the school. -Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. -Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Writes, Florida -Comprehensive Assessment Test, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. -Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students, and the community. -Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. -Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals, or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. -Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. -Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Thunderbolt Leadership Team meets monthly and is comprised of the three administrators, team leaders from every grade as well as a representative from our resource team, ese team, and support staff. We problem-solve around any and all concerns with a student-first mindset. Based on our Spring 2023 data, it was agreed that we needed to focus on reading.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

To ensure continuous improvement, we will regularly monitor our SIP for effective implementation after each assessment window closes as well as through our grade-level data meetings and monitoring of our quarterly data sheets.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	15	22	19	6	13	14	9	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	3	2	8	1	8	12	17	0	0	51
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	17	12	9	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	9	11	4	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	2	8	6	9	12	9	0	0	49

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	12	9	13	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	17	11	8	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	12	9	13	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	17	11	8	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	12	9	8	0	0	36

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	73			72			82		
ELA Learning Gains	66			68			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			56			59		
Math Achievement*	79			75			82		
Math Learning Gains	75			67			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65			55			67		
Science Achievement*	72			70			80		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	60			100			65		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	53			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	58			
HSP	72			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	73	66	53	79	75	65	72					60
SWD	55	51	41	59	61	59	48					
ELL	61	57		83	71							60
AMI												
ASN	68	69		91	85							
BLK	61	54	48	67	68	52						
HSP	68	62	64	74	85	93	61					
MUL	82	75		71	75							
PAC												
WHT	77	68	52	82	74	62	78					
FRL	64	59	60	66	71	67	45					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	72	68	56	75	67	55	70					100
SWD	52	58	50	60	57	48	56					
ELL	53			71								100
AMI												
ASN	88			94								
BLK	47	58	38	50	50	36	41					
HSP	67	61	45	67	75		57					
MUL	70	91		65	73							
PAC												
WHT	76	68	63	80	66	57	78					
FRL	67	57	45	63	59	59	42					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	82	72	59	82	72	67	80					65
SWD	65	55	41	74	79	80	66					
ELL	42	53	42	55	59	50						65
AMI												
ASN	88	67		92	89							
BLK	77	75		74	66		67					
HSP	69	63	60	72	63	53	74					70
MUL	83	69		83	69							
PAC												
WHT	85	74	61	84	73	69	86					
FRL	74	70	56	76	74	71	65					40

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Thunderbolt Elementary's lowest performing area is in Reading, specifically within the subgroup of students with disabilities. Reading scores have remained stagnant over the past three years overall.

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

Thunderbolt's greatest decline is our reading scores which have remained stagnant over the last three years.

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.

Historically Thunderbolt's scores are higher than the state average in all academic areas.

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

Thunderbolt's overall reading scores were the 4th highest in the district. The school's 5th grade Science scores increased from 72% to 75% and Math scores increased across all grade levels. Some of the actions we took included continued consultation with the Florida Inclusion Network (FIN) for professional development, classroom walkthroughs with feedback, and teacher support. Additional actions include the implementation of intensive Reading intervention groups for grades 3-6 which targeted our lowest quartile and ESE population.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Thunderbolt's main area of concern for this school year is Reading.

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

Thunderbolt's highest priority for school improvement for the upcoming school year is effective core reading instruction and targeted intensive interventions.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be explicit instruction in ELA focusing on targeted interventions for all students in grades K - 6. This focus is based on ELA achievement scores from state testing spanning the last three years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome for grades K-6 will be based on statewide progress monitoring scores (STAR Renaissance for grades K, 1, and 2, FAST for grades 3-6). Our goal is for schoolwide ELA achievement to increase from 72.4% to 75% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Our area of focus will be monitored through administrator classroom walkthroughs, quarterly data chats regarding our schoolwide reading intervention block, district coaching and training, grade-level/content weekly PLCs, and progress monitoring scores on state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Bathurst (amy.bathurst@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Standards-based instruction utilizing SAVVAS curriculum materials, Lexia CORE5, small group instruction based on specific student needs according to the Clay County School District Reading Decision Tree, utilizing district approved screeners and intervention materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our district-approved practices and curriculum have strong evidence-based data aligned with the Science of Reading to improve student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 identify a time school wide which will be focused on ELA interventions using district-approved practices and curriculum have strong evidence-based data aligned with the Science of Reading to improve student achievement

Person Responsible: Amy Bathurst (amy.bathurst@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of the first grading period.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A second area of focus will be explicit instruction in Math, focusing on targeted interventions for all students in grades K-6. This focus is based on Math achievement scores from state testing spanning the last three years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome for grades K-6 will be based on statewide progress monitoring scores (STAR Renaissance for grades K, 1, and 2, FAST for grades 3-6). Our goal is for schoolwide Math achievement to increase from (overall) 84% to 86% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Our area of focus will be monitored through administrator classroom walkthroughs, quarterly data chats regarding our schoolwide reading intervention block, and progress monitoring scores on state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Miller (jeffrey.miller@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Standards-based instruction utilizing Eureka Math Squared (K-5) and Florida Reveal Math (6th) curriculum materials, small group instruction based on specific student needs and utilizing the approved supplemental math materials - iReady (K-5), ALEKS (6th), and Building Fact Fluency (1st-6th).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our district-approved practices and curriculums have strong evidence-based data to improve student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Admin will monitor small group instruction based on specific student needs and utilizing the approved supplemental math materials - iReady (K-5), ALEKS (6th), and Building Fact Fluency (1st-6th) as evidenced by weekly classroom walkthroughs and quarterly data chats with teams.

Person Responsible: Jeffrey Miller (jeffrey.miller@myoneclay.net)

By When: Continuously throughout the school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be developing our positive culture and environment through empathy and a respectful climate that will create a supportive and fulfilling environment with learning conditions that meet the needs of all students. On the Spring 2023 Climate Survey we scored 60% of those who responded Strongly Agreed or Somewhat Agreed in the area of Empathy and 83.1% of those who responded Strongly Agreed or Somewhat Agreed in the area of Respectful Climate. This focus is based on a comparison of the Climate Survey from the Fall of 2019 and Spring of 2023 where we had a decrease in the area of Empathy by 23.3 % and Respectful Climate by 16.9%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome will be in the area of Empathy and Respectful Climate as measured on the Spring 2024 Climate Survey. Our goal is to increase Strongly Agree and Somewhat Agree by 5% in the area of Empathy to 65% and 5% in the area of Respectful Climate to 88.1%.

Monitoring:

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

Our progress towards increasing Empathy and a Respectful Climate will be monitored during School-Based Leadership Team meetings. We will have monthly open discussions around the school environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracey Finley (tracey.finley@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Administrators will ask reflective questions and encourage faculty and staff (when appropriate) to chat with team members who struggle with peers as a way to increase positive communication skills. We will also do daily "Shout Outs" for students who work hard and overcome obstacles as well as showing kindness to a friend and monthly shoutouts for faculty and staff in our front lounge area. We have monthly get-togethers such as Book Club or Movie trips to encourage respect and camaraderie among the staff. We also recognize staff members in our weekly newsletters (Shout-Out) which are submitted by admin and all staff members.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A respectful workplace with professionalism and empathy will create a supportive and fulfilling environment to help meet the needs of staff and students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Admin will discuss the efforts of all staff members and the effectiveness of our daily "Shout Outs" for students who work hard and overcome obstacles as well as showing kindness to a friend and monthly shout outs for faculty and staff in our front lounge area. We have monthly get-togethers such as Book Club or Movie trips to encourage respect and camaraderie among the staff. We also recognize staff members in our weekly newsletters (Shout-Out) which are submitted by admin and all staff members during our monthly team leadership meetings so adjustments can be made as needed.

Person Responsible: Tracey Finley (tracey.finley@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning with the September "SBLT" meeting and monthly for the remainder of the school year.

Clay County Schools

Tynes Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Tynes Elementary School

1550 TYNES BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://tes.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Tynes Elementary School in partnership with its children, families, and community will provide a superior education by providing quality instruction in a safe and orderly environment. Through their education at school, all students will gain the skills, strategies, and desire necessary for continued learning. They will also develop a strong sense of responsibility for themselves, their community, and each other. Our hope is to foster life-long learners and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tynes Elementary School wants to maintain its A school status while developing the whole student in areas of academics and social, and emotional learning.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brennan, Sarah	Principal	Develop and Monitor SIP including all relevant data and instructional practices related to improvement.
Christopher, Nakia	Assistant Principal	Develop and Monitor SIP including all relevant data and instructional practices related to improvement.
Huggins, Shelley	Instructional Coach	Monitor and implement MTSS plans and processes. Provide interventions and assess students to determine needs and support. Member of the SBLT and SLLT.
Granese, Victoria	Assistant Principal	Develop and Monitor SIP including all relevant data and instructional practices related to improvement.
Cambron, Michelle	SAC Member	Monitor SIP and hold meetings to collaborate with all stakeholders.
Green, Karen	Administrative Support	Attend SAC meetings as a representative and provide support related to the SIP and job description.
Wright, Eric	School Counselor	Monitor MTSS and 504 needs in relation to relevant SIP goals and increasing student achievement.
Goodwin, Cassie	Teacher, ESE	Monitor ESE needs in relation to relevant SIP goals and increasing student achievement.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SAC met on 8/28 to review draft SIP and provide feedback.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored via the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), and the School Literacy Leadership Team (SLLT) which both meet monthly, as well as by the administrative leadership team which meets weekly.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	32	25	21	24	18	21	30	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	6	0	1	6	5	5	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	23	34	23	0	0	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	15	49	11	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	24

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	14	13	9	5	13	5	19	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	24	14	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	22	37	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	11	28	15	0	0	59

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	3	4	3	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Absent 10% or more days	14	13	9	5	13	5	19	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	24	14	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	22	37	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	11	28	15	0	0	59

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	3	4	3	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67			63			69		
ELA Learning Gains	63			58			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			47			51		
Math Achievement*	71			66			76		
Math Learning Gains	68			62			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56			45			51		
Science Achievement*	74			71			75		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	100			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK	67			
HSP	69			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	63	53	71	68	56	74					
SWD	39	42	40	47	58	51	33					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	60	72	72	56	68	68	75					
HSP	76	70	60	76	67	64	67					
MUL	61	54		72	68							
PAC												
WHT	67	60	45	72	69	50	74					
FRL	59	61	54	59	66	63	70					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	58	47	66	62	45	71					
SWD	28	42	52	41	40	29	44					
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	50	45	49	54	33	41					
HSP	73	75		69	67		86					
MUL	69	47		64	60							
PAC												
WHT	63	57	41	69	64	45	74					
FRL	53	51	53	60	61	50	60					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	69	61	51	76	64	51	75					
SWD	39	32	33	54	46	41	48					
ELL	67	83		75	75							
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	57	50	36	69	57	41	52					
HSP	65	71	57	73	62	56	87					
MUL	79	67		91	79							
PAC												
WHT	70	61	50	76	64	52	77					
FRL	59	60	50	70	63	52	68					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Science proficiency declined from 74% to 48%. The 48% was significantly lower than both the district average of 63% and lower than the state average of 51%. Historically, science proficiency was a strength at Tynes. This was likely due to both a change in instructional staffing (both 5th grade science teachers moved to new positions) as well as a larger number of students with reading struggles.

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

Science proficiency declined from 74% to 48%. This was likely due to both a change in instructional staffing (both 5th grade science teachers moved to new positions) as well as a larger number of students with reading struggles.

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.

K-2 ELA, especially 1st grade ELA, was weaker than the state and the district. There was new programs and limited phonological awareness programs which could have led to the gap.

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

Overall, 4th grade improved in both reading and math proficiency from 22-23. Strategic placement of staff and personnel as well as strategic usage of online programs and supplemental materials.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Number of retainees at 3rd grade due to reading performance

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

1. K-2 Literacy
2. Students with significant reading deficiencies
3. SWD as compared to district.
4. Science proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our area of focus is positive recognition from adults while at school. 82% of adults strongly agreed that students received positive recognition from adults while only 30% of students strongly agreed with this statement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We hope to increase staff perceptions of positive recognition of students to 87% while increasing student perceptions to 35% strongly agreeing that they receive positive recognition from adults while at school.

Monitoring:

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

Climate and Culture surveys will be used to monitor the impact.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Granese (victoria.granese@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Verbal and non-verbal praise and recognition by all staff members on campus using our school-wide PBIS system and Tiger PRIDE.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By using our School-Wide motto of PRIDE (positivity, respect, integrity, determination, and effort) we can strengthen our school culture while continuously providing students with positive reinforcement and recognition.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Students will receive frequent (at least once every day) positive recognition in the form of a PBIS Reward or verbal praise related to one of the 5 areas of Tiger PRIDE.

Person Responsible: Victoria Granese (victoria.granese@myoneclay.net)

By When: According to the 2023-2024 Student climate survey, students at least 35% of students will report that they strongly agree that they receive positive recognition from adults while at school. May 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Grades K, 1, 3, and 5 were all below the county and state average on ELA achievement according to the 2022-2023 end-of-year FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase proficiency in ELA achievement in each grade level by at least 5% by the 2023-2024 EOY FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

By close monitoring of the FAST PM1 and PM2 data along with the PM3 FAST data we will be able to determine if our learning goals were beneficial in increasing student ELA Achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our evidence-based intervention for increasing student ELA achievement is to implement school-wide vocabulary programs that include opportunities for students to metacognitively determine the meanings of words in the context of all subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Vocabulary impacts all subject areas and can be a powerful strategy for determining word meanings and creating connections. Vocabulary strategies have a .64 effect size according to John Hattie's Visible Learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional Learning Communities and walkthrough logs will pay close attention to the effective implementation of this school-wide goal. Through the use of modeling, teacher spotlight examples, and planning opportunities teachers will effectively implement the school-wide vocabulary strategy into their content area instruction systematically and consistently.

Person Responsible: Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)

By When: By October 2023, we will see consistent use of school-wide vocabulary strategies as evidenced by walkthrough logs and consistent student work samples.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

According to our school's 2022-2023 STAR Early Literacy data, current second-grade students showed a gap in ELA proficiency with an overall ELA proficiency achievement of 33%. The Renaissance State Benchmark Mastery report showed that the students show a deficiency in the area of vocabulary with a median mastery score of 48%. Across K-2 our vocabulary data showed a need for remediation. Vocabulary is an essential component of reading and oral comprehension. If a student is unaware of the meaning of words or the skills needed to decipher words, it can have an impact on their ability to comprehend a text.

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

According to our school's 2022-2023 PM3 ELA FAST data, 3-5th grade students displayed a need for growth in the area of vocabulary. Our 3rd and 5th-grade students both scored low in the area of vocabulary. 3rd Grade context and connotations were only 25% above the standard while 5th grade was only 24%. Vocabulary is an essential component of reading and oral comprehension. If a student is unaware of the meaning of words or the skills needed to decipher words, it can have an impact on their ability to effectively comprehend a text. This can have a cross-curricular impact on student learning.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Current K-2 grade students will increase their overall ELA proficiency by 5% to fill in the gaps and assist them in making learning gains on the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Our area of focus: vocabulary, will be closely monitored for desired outcomes via walkthrough logs and professional learning communities centered around evidence-based ELA practice, and inspecting student work samples. These monitoring techniques will hold students accountable for the school-wide initiative implementation as well as provide a basis for continuous metacognitive processes throughout lesson planning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brennan, Sarah, sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Using John Hattie's Visible Learning as the basis for evidence-based vocabulary strategies and their effect size has helped us determine two vocabulary strategies with a 6.35 effect size- Semantic Mapping and Frayer Models.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The identified need to strengthen vocabulary is addressed by the focus and effect size of vocabulary instruction/programming. There is strong research to show the effectiveness of using vocabulary strategies within instruction to help students achieve higher levels.

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
<p>The School-Based Literacy Leadership team will be tasked with monitoring and disaggregating students' data frequently to determine the next steps for support and how to increase the rigor of the school-wide initiative.</p>	<p>Huggins, Shelley, shelley.huggins@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>Professional Learning Communities will be help weekly to share ideas for implementation and work through barriers. These community of learners will also be used to create assessments that test with fidelity the purpose and effectiveness of our school-wide vocabulary strategy.</p>	<p>Granese, Victoria, victoria.granese@myoneclay.net</p>

Clay County Schools

W E Cherry Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

W E Cherry Elementary School

420 EDSON DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://wec.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

(* The Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP can be made available in any language upon request.)

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Whiddon, Angie	Principal	The duties of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction of all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-6 iReady Math diagnostics, FAST data (PM2, PM2, PM3) and data from Lexia. The principal leads the meetings and provides a common vision for members in order to make data informed decisions.
Hogmire, Joshua	Assistant Principal	The duties of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction of all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-6 iReady Math diagnostics, FAST data (PM2, PM2, PM3) and data from Lexia. The assistant principal coleads the meetings and provides a common vision for members in order to make data informed decisions.
Conley, Angela	Teacher, ESE	The Chair of the SAC committee shall assist the principal in leading the committee to develop the SIP, PFEP and school's annual budget. ESE teachers provide information about the accommodations made for the ESE students to be successful with the core curriculum.
Bonnette, Morgan	Math Coach	Instructional coaches facilitate and support: best practices in the classroom, data collection, MTSS and implementation of curriculum.
Lee, Kristie	SAC Member	SAC committee members assist the principal in leading the committee to develop the SIP, PFEP and school's annual budget.
Cummings, Katheryn	Teacher, K-12	Title I teachers participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction in a small group setting, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 support.
Ganey, Emmalee	Teacher, K-12	General education teachers provide information about core instructional practices and curriculum, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction, collaborate with staff to provide Tier 2 interventions and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 support.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school based leadership team develops a draft SIP based on previous year's FAST data and is then presented to the SAC members for feedback and additional suggestions.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Grade level teams meet weekly to review current data and develop targeted interventions for students who are in the lowest quartile. Leadership team will meet with each grade level following the scheduled progress monitoring cycle (PM1, PM2, PM3). Once data is assessed and if revision is needed, the administration will request a SAC meeting to present proposed revisions to the SIP.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	59%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	7	10	12	11	11	10	5	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	3	1	2	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	11	3	3	1	4	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	4	5	1	4	8	2	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	15	17	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	5	21	14	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	11	6	10	13	12	0	0	57

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	4	13	0	0	0	20

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	5	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	22	20	20	19	18	19	29	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	3	1	2	9	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	4	11	3	3	1	4	3	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	4	5	1	4	8	2	8	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	9	10	13	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	10	16	14	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	2	6	5	3	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	7	2	6	3	4	7	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	22	20	20	19	18	19	29	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	3	1	2	9	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	4	11	3	3	1	4	3	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	4	5	1	4	8	2	8	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	9	10	13	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	10	16	14	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	2	6	5	3	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	7	2	6	3	4	7	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60			57			62		
ELA Learning Gains	62			52			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65			48			51		
Math Achievement*	66			59			68		
Math Learning Gains	74			64			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69			44			61		
Science Achievement*	68			57			65		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress							67		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	55			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	56			
HSP	58			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	64			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	62	65	66	74	69	68					
SWD	44	49	56	52	62	64	57					
ELL	46	45		62	73							
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	50	53	40	50	72	64	60					
HSP	49	50	60	65	65	67	50					
MUL	71	81		71	82		42					
PAC												
WHT	63	62	75	68	75	65	83					
FRL	58	58	55	61	76	76	64					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	57	52	48	59	64	44	57					
SWD	40	37	31	46	55	31	43					
ELL	26	42		56	73							
AMI												
ASN	77			100								
BLK	42	55	50	42	60	39	31					
HSP	48	42	33	52	65	62	42					
MUL	63	60		65	56		75					
PAC												
WHT	65	53	80	66	69	40	64					
FRL	56	52	35	54	63	40	56					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	62	58	51	68	68	61	65					67
SWD	48	44	48	59	59	57	62					
ELL	27	53	50	48	67							67
AMI												
ASN	75	64		94	100							
BLK	46	52	50	49	58	54	41					
HSP	45	46	42	60	61		69					64
MUL	57	44		75	75							
PAC												
WHT	75	68	68	77	71	65	77					
FRL	61	60	56	65	69	62	66					59

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

4th grade Math proficiency was our lowest category. Based on the 22-23 FAST Math results only 50% of our 4th graders scored at the proficiency level. We introduced a new math curriculum, so we had to adjust to a different mindset when approaching instruction. Also, there were several changes that took place with instructional leaders within the grade level.

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

4th grade Math proficiency was our greatest decline. Based on the 22-23 FAST Math results only 50% of our 4th graders scored at the proficiency level. We introduced a new math curriculum, so we had to adjust to a different mindset when approaching instruction. Also, there were several changes that took place with instructional leaders within the grade level. It dropped from 55% proficiency to 50%.

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.

Fourth grade math and sixth grade ELA were 11% lower than the state average. Students adjusted to a different test and format. Also, we introduced a new math program and approach to math instruction.

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

Third grade math improved from 50% proficiency to 65%. This is attributed to a highly effective professional learning community that consistently analyzed data and student performance. District math coaches were in the classrooms regularly assisting the teachers with using the new math curriculum with fidelity.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

A potential area of concern is the students with two or more indicators. The largest spike was our last year's 4th graders only having 6 students who had two or more indicators to current 5th graders with 13 students having two or more indicators.

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

1. 4th grade Math
2. 4th grade ELA
3. All grade levels ELA & Math proficiency due to proficiency levels dropping from previous year.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on 22-23 FAST ELA Reading data, only 56% of our 3rd through 6th graders showed proficiency in Reading. This is a 4% decline from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to increase our overall proficiency in Reading to 61%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will oversee student data and work with all teachers in an ongoing manner to use the data to drive instructional decisions. Data meetings via Professional Learning Communities will be held after each Progress Monitoring window.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following interventions will take place: small group instruction, progress monitoring, after school tutoring for our lowest quartile students, teachers having an expectation of success for all students and students using nonverbal instructional tools.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction - providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the traditional classroom setting must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance.

Progress monitoring - by continually monitoring a child's progress, teachers can gather the information they need to match lessons to an individual child's knowledge level.

After school tutoring - supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance will ensure better student performance.

Teachers having an expectation of success for all students - teacher expectations act as self-fulfilling prophecies because student achievement reflects expectations.

Nonverbal instructional tools - utilizing Chromebooks and desktop computers in the classroom provide individualized practice for testing and instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Administration will oversee student data and work with all teachers in an ongoing manner to use the data to drive instructional decisions. Data meetings will be held after each progress monitoring window.

Person Responsible: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

By When: After PM1, PM2 and PM3.

Title I will meet and discuss data in order to create small group and individual assignments in order to develop an inclusion schedule for those identified students.

Person Responsible: Kristie Lee (kristie.lee@myoneclay.net)

By When: Schedules will be made after PM1 and will be adjusted periodically based on teachers' needs.

Title I will prepare an after school tutoring schedule in addition to ESSER funded tutoring to provide extra support for those students identified as needing extra support.

Person Responsible: Katheryn Cummings (katheryn.cummings@myoneclay.net)

By When: The first session of after school tutoring begin mid October and end on December 15, 2023. The second session will begin in late January and will end mid April, 2024.

Chromebooks, headphones, monitors, desktop computers will be utilized to meet the academic needs of each child.

Person Responsible: Joshua Hogmire (joshua.hogmire@myoneclay.net)

By When: Technology devices will be ordered throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on 22-23 FAST Math data, only 60% of our 3rd through 6th graders showed proficiency in Math. This is a 6% decline from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to increase our overall proficiency in Math to 63%.

Monitoring:

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

The school leadership team and Math teachers will meet quarterly to analyze iReady Math, FAST Math Progress Monitoring and Eureka data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Morgan Bonnette (morgan.bonnette@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following interventions will take place: small group instruction, progress monitoring, after school tutoring for our lowest quartile students, teachers having an expectation of success for all students and students using nonverbal instructional tools.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction - providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the traditional classroom setting must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance.

Progress monitoring - by continually monitoring a child's progress, teachers can gather the information they need to match lessons to an individual child's knowledge level.

After school tutoring - supplement learning from the school day and provide targeted assistance to ensure better student performance.

Teachers having an expectation of success for all students - teacher expectations act as self-fulfilling prophecies because student achievement reflects expectations.

Nonverbal instructional tools - utilizing Chromebooks and desktop computers in the classroom provide individualized practice for testing and instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Title I and administration will meet and discuss data in order to create small groups and individual assignments in order to develop an inclusion schedule for those identified students.

Person Responsible: Kristie Lee (kristie.lee@myoneclay.net)

By When: Schedules will be made after PM1 and will be adjusted periodically based on student mastery and progress.

Administration will oversee student data and work with all teachers in an ongoing manner to use the data to drive instructional decisions. Data meetings will be held after each progress monitoring window.

Person Responsible: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

By When: After PM1, PM2 and PM3.

Title I will prepare an after school tutoring schedule in addition to ESSER funded tutoring to provide extra support for those students identified as needing extra support.

Person Responsible: Katheryn Cummings (katheryn.cummings@myoneclay.net)

By When: The first session of after school tutoring begin mid October and end on December 15, 2023. The second session will begin in late January and will end mid April, 2024.

Chromebooks, headphones, monitors, desktop computers will be utilized to meet the academic needs of each child.

Person Responsible: Joshua Hogmire (joshua.hogmire@myoneclay.net)

By When: Technology devices will be ordered at the beginning of the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our area of focus this school year will be building staff relationships with each other, students and families.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the "Strongly Agree" responses from 66% to 70% on the student and teacher climate surveys that relate to a positive environment.

Monitoring:

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

Climate and informal surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Staff and students completed "All About Me" questionnaires. Teachers, students and parents will attend a monthly grade level parent night to learn strategies to continue the learning at home.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A positive environment will be achieved when teachers, students and parents work together to create positive morale and a sense of community.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create a mentorship program with new teachers and experienced teachers.

Person Responsible: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

By When: This is on-going and incorporated in our professional development program.

Create a school-wide discipline plan with input from teacher leaders.

Person Responsible: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

By When: This was completed before school started in August.

Create a calm corner in each room when students need to decompress.

Person Responsible: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

By When: The corners will be created in each classroom before the year starts.

All About Me forms will be distributed to students, so teachers can form relationships with students.

Person Responsible: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

By When: This will be completed by Labor Day.

Parents will participate in community/family nights that include academic activities.

Person Responsible: Angie Whiddon (angela.whiddon@myoneclay.net)

By When: Events will occur throughout the year.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

In addition to our webpage (<https://wec.myoneclay.net/>), we will disseminate the SIP and all progress to our stakeholders through quarterly SAC meetings held on campus. The plan will be given to the stakeholders in attendance for their review. If a stakeholder in attendance at the meeting requests a review of the data or language used in the SIP, the SAC will consider the request as a committee and determine if revisions need to be made. The plan will then be presented for approval with the understanding that revisions can be made as needed.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

In addition to our website (<https://wec.myoneclay.net/>), W.E. Cherry plans to build and grow our positive relationships with our parents, families, and other stakeholders in order to fulfill our mission by engaging them in grade-level parent nights, sharing upcoming events and activities on our school Facebook page, utilizing printed flyers to send home with each student and encouraging the parents to attend our Open House/Book Fair night.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The administration will oversee student data and work with all teachers in an ongoing manner to use the data to drive instructional decisions. Data meetings via PLCs will be held after each Progress Monitoring window. The following interventions will take place: small group instruction, progress monitoring, after-school tutoring for our lowest quartile students, teachers having an expectation of success for all students, and students using nonverbal instructional tools.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes

Clay County Schools

Wilkinson Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Wilkinson Junior High School

5025 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://wjh.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Wilkinson Junior High is to provide learning opportunities that increase academic achievement and cultivate a sense of self respect, accountability, and resilience within every student. As a school, we are dedicated to ensuring that every student receives a high quality education in a safe, supportive, and effective learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Wilkinson Junior High we believe it takes the collective effort among families, students, and the school staff to ensure a positive learning environment and successful outcomes for all students. As a school, we want to see parents committed to holding their student accountable and becoming an active participant in their student's education. Respectively, we want to see students acknowledge that their attitude, participation, and efforts determine their success in school. Lastly, we want to see our school staff continue to deliver high impact practices in an environment that promotes inclusivity and high expectations for all students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Warmouth, Nathan	Principal	Principals
Rockwell, Jessica	Dean	Dean, Title I Coordinator, Co-Dept Head SS
Carella, Christopher	Assistant Principal	VP
Moriarty, Micheala	Assistant Principal	AP
Ammons, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	ELA, Dept Head
Campbell, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Science, Dept Head
Doughty, Steven	Teacher, K-12	Math, Dept Head
Eaton, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	PE, Fine Art/PE Dept Head
Ford , Linda	Teacher, ESE	Support Facilitator, ESE Dept Head
Phillips, Jeff	Paraprofessional	ESE Asst
Pope, Mylan	Teacher, K-12	SS, Co-Dept Head
Sanford, Tammie	Parent Engagement Liaison	bookkeeper, community and parent liason

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year parents, teachers, staff, and students were surveyed for potential leadership, extracurricular, and SAC opportunities. Based on interests and results from the survey, the individuals on SAC were selected. All stakeholders were involved in the approval of the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be consistently monitored and revised for continuous improvement on a quarterly basis through data analysis during bi-weekly PLC groups, as well as data chats with administration team. Each quarter data from F.A.S.T PM's and/or district designed performance matters will be reviewed and utilized to drive further instructional decisions at the school level and within the classroom.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	59%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	100	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	57	145
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	112	289
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	38	93
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	112	289

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	57	108

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days				0	0	0	0	0	117	117	234
One or more suspensions				0	0	0	0	0	51	36	87
Course failure in ELA				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				0	0	0	0	0	56	88	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				0	0	0	0	0	38	51	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.				0	0	0	0	0	80	79	159

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	57	108

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	117	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	36	87
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	88	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	79	159

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	57	108

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44			49			48		
ELA Learning Gains	41			46			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28			36			47		
Math Achievement*	60			54			63		
Math Learning Gains	58			46			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55			46			55		
Science Achievement*	61			63			50		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*	79			74			74		
Middle School Acceleration	62			55			67		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
BLK	51			
HSP	58			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	44	41	28	60	58	55	61	79	62			
SWD	20	28	24	31	46	44	23	54	33			
ELL	27	18		36	55							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	35	27	53	50	50	50	81	73			
HSP	46	46	46	57	61	67	59	86	56			
MUL	50	48		50	56	70	63	88	36			
PAC												
WHT	44	40	26	61	58	53	62	77	63			
FRL	38	38	24	50	56	53	49	69	46			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	49	46	36	54	46	46	63	74	55			
SWD	19	36	33	29	40	38	25	53	39			
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	43	31	38	46	62	46	71	44			
HSP	47	51	75	47	35	31	53	70	60			
MUL	64	60		63	47		76	82	67			
PAC												
WHT	50	45	31	56	47	45	64	74	54			
FRL	44	45	43	40	40	40	56	66	41			

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	49	47	63	65	55	50	74	67			
SWD	22	43	39	35	55	49	21	51	46			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	57	50	52	76	71	34	76	67			
HSP	54	54	53	47	50	53	50	75	74			
MUL	38	53		56	53							
PAC												
WHT	47	48	46	65	65	54	51	73	64			
FRL	44	47	43	59	63	50	44	68	67			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA, 46% as a school. 43% for 7th, 48% for 8th. We were the only jr high to have increases in scores, although small. We had our entire first semester with 3 long term subs and did not have all ELA positions filled until January 23'.

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

None. All of our scores increased from the previous year. 21'-22' we were 5th, 6th, or 7th in almost all academic categories. The 22'-23' school year we had gains in every category. WJH increased all scores and were in the top 3 in all categories, except ELA, which was 4th in the district.

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.

ELA, 7th grade. State average was 47%, we were at 43%. WJH was the only jr high to have increases in scores, although small. We had our entire first semester with 3 long term subs and did not have all ELA positions filled until January 23'.

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

Math, increased a total of 23%. Increased 9% in 7th and 14% in 8th. Focused on data driven PLC's and common assessments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance
Level 1 assessment Failures

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

- 1) ELA; reading/writing
- 2) Math; increase overall Math gains
- 3) PBIS; continue to decrease the number of referrals written

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to F.A.S.T data from the 2022-2023 school year, 41% of seventh and eighth grade students were proficient in English Language Arts (ELA). Furthermore, data results from the past three years shows that our Students with Disabilities (SWD) population performed below 41% in ELA proficiency levels. Additionally, our English Language Learners (ELL) also performed below 41% last school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase reading proficiency from 45.00% to over 50% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

FAST; PM1, 2, and 3 as well as Lexia Power Up.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Explicit vocabulary instruction

Visual Representations

Frequent Student Practice

Provide Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day

Progress Monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Explicit vocabulary instruction. Vocabulary learning is effective when it entails active engagement that goes beyond definitional knowledge.
2. Visual Representations. Visuals help students make sense out of the content and direct attention, increasing the possibilities that the learners will remember the material.
3. Frequent Student Practice. Spacing out repeated exposure and engagement with concepts, practice problems, or skills over time bolsters retention, especially when compared to reviewing concepts.
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day. Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and other nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills.
5. Progress Monitoring. Research has demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

-District ELA Specialist/Coaches to hold Professional Development on how "Explicit Vocabulary Instruction"

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of quarter one beginning of quarter two

We would like to incorporate Progress Learning and Vocabulary.com as a supplemental part of our ELA/ Reading Curriculum; as it aligns with our current SAVVAS and State Benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: As soon as district curriculum council approves supplemental materials (Sept 14th).

Use visual models to represent strategies used to increase Reading skills

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter one

Interactive TV's (enhanced classroom equipment) to enhance student engagement, assist teachers with engaging and interactive lessons, and provided visual representations

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter one or beginning of quarter two pending when panels come in.

Target Lower Quartile, SWB, and ELL students through after school tutoring focus on Reading skills and other struggling standards/benchmarks).

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning quarter 2 after

District ELA Specialist/Coaches to hold Professional Development on how "Direct-explicit Instruction" using Corrective Reading and Spelling through Morphographs

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter 2 or beginning of quarter 3

Teachers will model explicitly how to break-down a text, annotate, and then summarize to grow in Reading Fluency/Comprehension (using supplemental reading materials that cross-content so students are exposed to different subjects)

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the first quarter

Teachers and administrators will meet to disaggregate student data and create actions steps for all students based on the data. Teachers will also meet for professional development opportunities led by Progress Learning.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of quarter 1, 2, 3, and 4

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to F.A.S.T data results from the 2022-2023 school year, our SWD and ELL students performed below proficiency rates. Furthermore, data trends show over the past three years our Students with Disabilities (SWD) population performed below 41% in ELA and math proficiency levels. Additionally, our English Language Learners (ELL) also performed below 41% in both areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase proficiency scores in both ELA and math to 42% or better for our SWD and ELL subgroup populations.

Monitoring:

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

ELA and Math F.A.S.T PM 1, 2, and 3 data, Lexia Power Up, Aleks, and ELL access assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Explicit vocabulary instruction
2. Visual Representations
3. Frequent Student Practice
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day
5. Progress Monitoring
6. Push in Support
7. ELL students enrolled in intensive reading
8. ELL students will receive Rosetta Stone program and educational time to use program

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Explicit vocabulary instruction. Vocabulary learning is effective when it entails active engagement that goes beyond definitional knowledge.
2. Visual Representations. Visuals help students make sense out of the content and direct attention, increasing the possibilities that the learners will remember the material.
3. Frequent Student Practice. Spacing out repeated exposure and engagement with concepts, practice problems, or skills over time bolsters retention, especially when compared to reviewing concepts.
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day. Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and other nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills.
5. Progress Monitoring. Research has demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance.
6. Push in Support. Utilizing ESE staffing specialists and ESE assistants to provide daily push in supports as stated in student IEP.
7. ELL students enrolled in intensive reading for systematic phonics instruction. Students will receive daily oral language acquisition to learn English.

8. ELL students will receive 45 to 60 minutes assisted language practice in Rosetta Stone to acquire the English language.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Use visual models to represent strategies used to increase Reading skills. Use visual models and manipulatives to support and scaffold in math.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through the fourth quarter

Use engaging supplemental online program to monitor student progress, assist teachers with literacy instructional decision making, and support student practice with B.E.S.T standards and reading comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter or beginning second quarter

Target Lower Quartile, SWB, and ELL students through after school tutoring (focus on Reading skills and other struggling standards/benchmarks).

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter or beginning of second quarter

Teachers and administrators will meet to disaggregate student data and create actions steps for all students based on the data. Teachers will also meet for professional development opportunities led by Progress Learning.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter and throughout the remainder of the year.

Receive ongoing training from ESE and ESOL specialist and coaches to obtain best practices for meeting the needs of our SWD and ELL subgroups.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through the remainder of the year.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to F.A.S.T data from the 2022-2023 school year, 62% of seventh and eighth grade students were proficient in math. Data results from the past three years shows that our Students with Disabilities (SWD) population performed below 41% in math proficiency levels. Additionally, our English Language Learners (ELL) also performed below 41% last school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase overall Math achievement from 62.00% to 70.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

F.A.S.T PM 1, 2, 3; Aleks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Teacher Modeling
2. Visual Representation
3. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day
4. Frequent Student Practice
5. Progress Monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Teacher Modeling. Modeling empowers students to begin their tasks with the confidence to proceed. It then allows teachers to monitor students who may need extra support as they struggle to implement the new concept or skill.
2. Visual Representations. Visuals help students make sense out of the content and direct attention, increasing the possibilities that the learners will remember the material.
3. Frequent Student Practice. Spacing out repeated exposure and engagement with concepts, practice problems, or skills over time bolsters retention, especially when compared to reviewing concepts.
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day. Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and other nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills.
5. Progress Monitoring. Research has demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers model expected academic achievement through effective instruction monitoring progress through common Formative and Summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through fourth quarter

Use visual models to represent strategies used to increase Math Achievement

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through fourth quarter

Interactive TVs will be utilized (enhanced classroom equipment) to enhance student engagement, assist teachers with engaging and interactive lessons, and provide visual representations.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter or beginning of second pending the arrival of panels.

Tablets available for tactile learners and student who need flexible setting. Tablets will allow students to manipulate and use a hands on approach with Aleks and district approved math games.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter or beginning of second quarter pending arrival of tablets.

Target Lower Quartile, SWD, and ELL students through before school, after school, and Saturday school tutoring (using math data to focus on the benchmarks/skills students are struggling with)

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First through fourth quarter

Use of engaging tools and manipulatives to utilize during whole group/small group instruction to practice mathematic skills. Use of manipulaives supports the needs of tactile learners and learners with multiple modalities.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First through fourth quarter

Teachers and administrators will meet to disaggregate student data and create actions steps for all students based on the data.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: End of first, second, and third quarter

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to data obtained from district Synergy reports, 1047 students were referred during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase positive behaviors (less discipline referrals) from 1047 to under 800.

Monitoring:

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

Synergy Systems, monthly behavior reports will be observed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Establish Positive Connections
2. Schools and Families Have Meaningful Two-Way Communication (PFE)
3. Plan relevant instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Establish Positive Connections. Partnerships between schools and families can improve students' grades, attendance, persistence, and motivation.
2. Schools and Families Have Meaningful Two-Way Communication (PFE). Partnerships between schools and families can improve students' grades, attendance, persistence, and motivation.
3. Plan relevant instruction. Instruction that meets academic, social, socioeconomic, and multicultural needs will ensure that all students are getting the learning they need to be successful.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers conduct parent/teacher conferences to create a sound foundation/partnership between all parties

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of quarter 2

Teachers send positive postcards home (students will receive quarterly)

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter 1 through quarter 4.

Share important information through Synergy, ROBO calls home (or individual calls), paper copies of information, parent/teacher conferences (discuss academic/behavioral concerns and growths), meetings with the Principal, information on school website and social media

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter 1 through quarter 4.

Teachers engage in a book study to help inform decisions in the classroom

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of quarter 1 or beginning of quarter 2.

Plan and implement the following events: Annual Title I Parent Night, parent/teacher conference night, and parent family engagement events for ELA, Math, and PBIS.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter one through the remainder of the year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Our main areas of opportunity are English Language Arts, Math, and PBIS. Additionally, we are focusing on our Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners. Our scheduling this school year allowed us to have support facilitator push-in models to support ELA and Math, with a focus on our SWD population. We scheduled Students with disabilities, intentionally in order that the facilitator supports specific students each day. Our English Language Learners are placed into intensive reading classrooms to focus on reading skills to acquire the English Language. Rosetta Stone is also provided daily for independent, online instruction support for students to improve the English speaking and reading acquisition.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

n/a

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Warmouth, Nathan, nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

n/a

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

n/a

Warmouth, Nathan, nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

4965 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://wes.oneclay.net>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Wilkinson Elementary, we provide high levels of learning for all students. We increase student achievement by having high standards and expectations in which students value and develop a drive, desire, and passion for learning. This is achieved by students being actively engaged in the learning process. By creating an optimal learning environment built on respect, safety and kindness, all students are achievers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wilkinson Elementary exists to provide a safe, caring and stimulating environment to prepare life long learners for success by assisting them in acquiring the necessary skills to achieve their fullest potential in a competitive global workplace.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hayward, Carolyn	Principal	Instructional leader/supervisor of the school and all school activities
Hoffman, Kara	Assistant Principal	Leader of PBIS and staff professional development, head of discipline
Hinton, Taylor	Teacher, K-12	Grade 6 teacher, SAC chair
Jones, LeAnne	Teacher, K-12	Title I ELA, Title I compliance
VanVactor, Alice	Teacher, K-12	Title I ELA, ITF
Massey, Brian	Teacher, K-12	Title I math and science
Amidon, Sara	Teacher, K-12	Grade 1 Team Lead
Schloffman, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Grade 3 Team Lead
Adkison, Wendi	Teacher, K-12	Grade 6 Team Lead
Anloague, Arnold	School Counselor	guidance and assessment
Wright, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	Resource Team Lead
LaSauce, Joy	Teacher, K-12	Grade 4 Team Lead

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council including administrators, teachers and school staff, parents and community members, meets regularly throughout the year to evaluate the needs of the school and its stakeholders. During the first meeting of the year, SAC members will review the data and evaluate the goals and action steps proposed in the draft of the SIP. They may suggest changes as they see fit.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP monitoring will occur at least quarterly. Data from all sources (FAST/STAR, i-REady, Lexia, classroom performance, etc.) will be reviewed regularly by teachers and administrators in data meetings and PLC. The School Literacy Leadership Team (SLLT) comprised of teachers and school and district level administrators and specialists, will meet monthly to review the progress of ELA instruction and interventions. The ITF and school psychologist will meet monthly with teachers of scholars in MTSS to review their progress. If the data indicate that the plan requires revision, this will be done through our School Advisory Council.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	15%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	17	22	16	15	27	24	35	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	4	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	20	18	20	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	13	19	18	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	4	12	14	0	0	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	29	23	29	27	30	27	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	6	5	4	6	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	2	6	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	1	0	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	19	22	8	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	12	18	9	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	30	16	21	8	22	0	0	118

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	4	5	14	7	9	1	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	29	23	29	27	30	27	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	6	5	4	6	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	2	6	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	1	0	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	19	22	8	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	12	18	9	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	30	16	21	8	22	0	0	118

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	4	5	14	7	9	1	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52			50			53		
ELA Learning Gains	56			57			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51			60			59		
Math Achievement*	63			57			57		
Math Learning Gains	67			53			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67			40			40		
Science Achievement*	55			48			58		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	55			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	56	51	63	67	67	55					
SWD	31	46	42	43	54	56	39					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50	50		50	71							
MUL	64			57								
PAC												
WHT	53	55	51	64	68	67	57					
FRL	48	53	52	60	67	70	47					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	50	57	60	57	53	40	48					
SWD	37	57	65	42	48	46	25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47			53								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	57	62	57	52	39	47					
FRL	45	53	52	50	48	41	38					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	53	58	59	57	56	40	58					
SWD	34	44	50	38	50	40	44					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	60	54		55	31							
HSP	42			50								
MUL	50			60								
PAC												
WHT	53	58	58	57	57	40	57					
FRL	49	57	64	54	51	38	56					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

With 49% proficiency, Science was our lowest area of performance. After experiencing a significant gain last year, from 48% to 55%, this was a surprising loss. Teachers new to this content area likely contributed to this decline. Additionally, many of our scholars lack the basic foundational skills needed to comprehend the content and assessment. We will address this need through our ELA and Math goals.

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

Science was also our area of greatest decline, going from 55% in 2022 to 49% in 2023. Teachers new to this content area likely contributed to this decline. Scholars in this cohort also experienced substantial need in the basic reading and math skills necessary for success in science. We will address these deficiencies in our ELA and Math goals.

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.

ELA (grades 3-6) had the greatest gap when compared to the state proficiency. Although grade 3, at 61% proficient was significantly above the state average of 50%, our average for grades 3-6 was 49% proficient, compared to the state average of 52%. Although we made efforts to increase attendance, 35% of scholars in grades 4-6 had absences of 10% or greater. This greatly impacted our ability to reach them.

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

ELA showed the most improvement schoolwide from 52% in 2022 to 57% in 2023, with Grade 3 improving 19% over last year. This met our school improvement goal. We had a strategic emphasis on increasing reading proficiency, and incorporated new actions utilizing Kid Lips (K-1), and SRA Corrective Reading for selected scholars in grades 2-6.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Upon reflection of the EWS data, attendance and scholars scoring level 1 in reading and math are areas of concern. Though we have made a concerted effort to improve attendance, we still had 156 scholars with less than 90% attendance last year. Our scholars scoring level 1 in reading decreased only slightly from 75 to 71, while those scoring a 1 in math increased from 63 to 64.

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

1. ELA--increase overall proficiency
2. Math--increase overall proficiency
3. PBIS--increase parent and family engagement

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A strategic focus will be placed on achieving an increase in overall ELA proficiency schoolwide. Current data indicates that 57% of our scholars are proficient in ELA. An increase in this area will close the achievement gap in reading and will translate across curriculums, affecting and increase in achievement in all other content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency in reading from 57% to 62% as measured by FAST/STAR.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will be STAR (K-2) and FAST (3-6), in addition to Acadience and Lexia Core.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 components of reading
 Small group instruction
 Direct-explicit instruction
 Explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction
 Progress monitoring
 Teacher access to training
 Explicit comprehension strategy
 Explicit vocabulary instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to their ESSA ratings, there is strong evidence to support the lasting effects of these strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Strategic use of instructional coaches and curriculum specialists to support teachers and paraprofessionals

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023, on-going

60 minute ELA intervention block supported by Title I coaches and paraprofessionals

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Targeted intervention groups utilizing evidence-based strategies and tools for instruction (Corrective Reading, Spelling through Morphographs, Spelling Mastery, Sound Partners, SIPPS, PRIDE) as student need requires

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Weekly PLCs and data meetings (at least 3 times a year--B/M/E) to inform instruction by analyzing instruction, assessment, and student work

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Purchase of technology (chromebooks, document cameras, earbuds) to support instruction (Lexia Core, Savvas, and Google Classroom) and assessment (FAST/STAR). Tech assisted instruction will allow for targeted comprehension instruction, as well as remediation and extension in reading comprehension. Data derived from FAST/STAR will inform instruction, assisting with the formation of and instruction of targeted small groups.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023

Kid Lips will be implemented in all K-1 classrooms to support phonemic awareness which is an essential element leading to reading comprehension.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Heggerty will be implemented in all K-2 classrooms to support the foundational skills essential to reading comprehension.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Assessment of scholars grades K-6 using Acadience 3 times a year to determine effectiveness of tier 1 instruction and scholar need with the support of an assessment team including Title I teachers and Title I funded "Adult Temporary Labor" who will be hired to administer the assessment, calculate scores and evaluate results 2 weeks beginning, mid, and end of year.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Teachers in grades K-6 will be invited to participate in an after-school book study of Fair Isn't Always Equal, in which they will discuss assessment and grading in the differentiated classroom. They will explore ways this can be used to instruct and evaluate reading comprehension.

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023

Supplies will be purchased to support the goal of reading comprehension (mirrors, paper, cardstock, toner, etc.)

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Comprehension of informational text will be emphasized utilizing Studies Weekly (Science).

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Vocabulary will be explicitly taught in Math, ELA and Science.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Science concepts and vocabulary will be reinforced with informational text.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A strategic focus will be placed on achieving an increase in overall math proficiency schoolwide. Current data indicates that 61% of our scholars are proficient in math. An increase in this area will establish our scholars as confident problem-solvers, ready to advance to higher level math topics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency from 61% to 66% as measured by STAR/FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will be STAR (grades K-2) and FAST (grades 3-6).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Dedicated time for math in the school schedule
Individual and small group instruction
Visual representations
Teacher modeling
Demonstrate multiple problem-solving strategies
Teacher access to training

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to their ESSA ratings, there is strong evidence to support the lasting effects of these strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will increase scholar fluency utilizing the supplemental curriculum Building Fact Fluency (Grades 1-2 addition/subtraction; Grade 3 addition/subtraction, multiplication/division; Grades 4-6 multiplication/division)

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Teachers will utilize Eureka Math 2 curriculum with fidelity to develop mathematical thinking and reasoning skills.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Strategic use of Title I funded coach and district curriculum specialists to support instructional and paraprofessional staff.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

A Title I funded math teacher will be hired for class size reduction

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023

Scholars needing intensive remediation may receive Corrective Math

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

Interactive Monitors will be used to enhance instruction and student interaction.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

PLCs and data meetings to inform instruction by analyzing instruction, assessment, and student work.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Generation Genius site license will be utilized in STEM resource to support achievement in math.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 9/2023, on-going

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A strategic focus will be student engagement. Because we know that parent and family involvement in school activities can increase student engagement, we will strive to increase parent and family engagement as measured by attendance at parent and family events.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase parent and family engagement as measured by attendance at PFE events from 43% to 50% by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will track the percentage of parents attending at least 1 PFE event.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Foster positive relationships

Teachers having and expectation of success for all students

Volunteering: Offering parents opportunities to visit their child's school and find ways to recruit and train parents

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that the strategies we have selected have a high correlation to positive outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Staff will participate in professional development on the importance of parent and family engagement.

Person Responsible: Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

By When: 10/2023

Parents will be encouraged to recognize staff members using the Wildcat Wow form.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Parent volunteer meeting 8/25 to introduce volunteer opportunities

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/25/2023

Parents will be notified of all PFE events as early as possible and in at least 3 ways (flier, social media, phone calls, synergy email, newsletters).

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/23, on-going

Teachers and staff will actively promote parental involvement at all conferences.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Sign-in sheets and feedback forms from every event will be analyzed to address barriers to attendance and level of parental engagement.

Person Responsible: LeAnne Jones (mary.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

SAC members will regularly meet to address attendance barriers and seek parental input in providing and promoting quality events which will support student achievement through home/school connection.

Person Responsible: Taylor Hinton (taylor.hinton@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/29/2023, on-going

Print center copies of student planners and Home/School Learning compacts will promote engagement of scholars and families.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

By When: 8/2023, on-going

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

2022-23 Data from STAR PM 3 reflects the following are not on track to score a level 3 or above:

Kindergarten-10%

Grade 1 - 31%

Grade 2 - 25%

Current year's data is forthcoming.

Scholars in Grades K-2 are supported in their emerging literacy skills through a high quality tier 1 curriculum, Savvas, supplemented with From Phonics to Reading, Heggerty for phonemic awareness, and Lexia Core 5. Additionally, grades K and 1 also participate daily in Kid Lips. Teachers and trained paraprofessionals scaffold instruction in the small group setting, supporting the individual needs of scholars based upon data. These evidence-based practices and programs were selected because they have demonstrated statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes.

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

2022-23 Data from FAST PM data:

Grade 3 - 39% below level 3

Grade 4 - 55% below level 3

Grade 5 - 57% below level 3

Current year's data is forthcoming.

Scholars in Grades 3-5 are working to increase their decoding skills with the ultimate goal of comprehending grade level text in all subjects. This is done utilizing a high quality tier 1 curriculum, Savvas, which is supplemented with From Phonics to Reading in Grade 3, Spelling Through Morphology in Grade 4, and Lexia Core 5. Scholars in need of intervention may receive SRA Corrective Reading, Spelling Mastery, PRIDE Reading and Spelling, or the Wilson System. Targeted small group instruction allows teachers and trained paraprofessionals to meet the specific needs of each scholar. These evidence-based practices and programs were selected because of their demonstrated statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 2022-23 data, Grades K-2 are not projected to have 50% or less on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 2022-23 data, 52% of scholars in Grade 4 did not meet proficiency. Our goal is to reduce this to no more than 45% below Level 3 by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Quarterly data meetings will be held with all faculty where all data sources including FAST/STAR progress monitoring, Lexia Core/Power Up, Savvas, Acadience and intervention data are reviewed to determine their effect upon our desired outcomes. As needed, scholars may be evaluated for different and/or additional interventions. ELA PLCs will meet weekly to review/revise instruction. Observational data from administrators and/or district content coaches/specialists will be used to monitor progress. The newly formed SLLT will meet monthly to monitor progress and evaluate needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

In accordance with the District's CERP and the B.E.S.T. standards, the following evidence-based practices/programs will be implemented to achieve the anticipated outcomes:

90 minutes of daily, uninterrupted, tier 1 core instruction SAVVAS

Lexia Core 5, K-5

Heggerty , grades K-2

From Phonics to Reading, grades k-3

Kid Lips, grade K-1

Spelling Mastery, grades 3-5 tier 2

Spelling through Morphographs, grades 3-6 tier 2

SIPPS, grades 1-2 tier 2

SRA Decoding/Corrective Reading, grades 3-6 tier 3

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence-based practices and programs above were selected in accordance with the CERP and because they have demonstrated statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes.

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
<p>A School Literacy Leadership Team consisting of teacher leaders, administration, and district literacy experts will be formed to review data and progress toward our goal monthly.</p>	<p>Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>All scholars will be assessed using Acadience Reading 3 times a year to evaluate progress and the need for intervention.</p>	<p>Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>To strengthen their instructional practice, ELA teachers will be offered the following professional learning opportunities: Grades 2-6: Teachers will collaboratively plan, deliver, and evaluate instruction with district coaches and curriculum specialists. Grades K-6: Fair Isn't Always Equal; Teachers will learn to assess and differentiate standards based learning MTSS leadership: The RTI Approach for Evaluating Learning Disabilities; Annual Growth for All Students, Catch Up Growth for Those Who Are Behind Title I Coaches: Better Conversations</p>	<p>Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net</p>