

St. Johns County School District

Ocean Palms Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Ocean Palms Elementary School

355 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

<http://www-ope.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	5%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridaCIMS.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Ocean Palms we inspire students to explore and develop their strengths and passions. We focus on integrity, leadership, and service above self. We commit to fostering a positive, safe, nurturing environment with an emphasis on academic rigor, the arts, athletics, and technology within a vibrant, caring community.

- Our focus is the whole child.

School Motto - Everyday. Everyone. Everything matters!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ocean Palms Elementary is where students become leaders:

Lead by example
Encourage others
Accepts challenges
Do the right thing
Explore their passions
Reflect on learning
Strive for academic excellence

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Cantwell, Tiffany	Principal
Morgan, Brian	Assistant Principal
Proietto, Michael	Instructional Coach
Sherwood, Shannon	Psychologist
Pellegrino, Olivia	School Counselor

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The Core Leadership Team is designated as a working group consisting of the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, School Counselor, and School Psychologist. They provide data on RtI/MTSS procedures and goals as well as input regarding academic and behavioral areas that need to be addressed and levels of support for students. The Leadership Team receives annual training from the district and continues to receive ongoing training throughout the year. Professional Development for RtI/MTSS is conducted for the staff on an ongoing basis. The Leadership Team then evaluates additional staff professional development needs during weekly PLC meetings throughout the year.

The Core Leadership Team will focus on all students making learning gains in all subject areas. Focus will be placed on reading and math learning gains with an emphasis on common assessments and differentiated instruction.

The school leadership team:

- Carries out the mission and vision of the school.
- Provides vision for both academic and behavioral success.
- Plans, implements and monitors the progress of school improvement.
- Implements RtI/MTSS as a school-wide method of raising student achievement outcomes based on data.
- Conducts weekly meetings to review and analyze formative and summative assessment data.

Principal: Oversight of school management, instructional leadership, operational leadership, budget, staff and community communication, teacher and staff evaluations, student discipline support, data disaggregation, oversight of School Improvement Plan, support RTI/MTSS core team and garners information for future opportunities, Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), Safety team coordinator and drills, crisis team member, testing and master scheduling, and ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

Assistant Principal: Oversight of IEP's, teacher and staff evaluations, student discipline support, data disaggregation, MTSS & Core team member, Safety team member, crisis team coordinator, employee, student and parent supports, bully investigations, curriculum support, textbooks, field study/trip, transportation, and Character Counts District Steering Committee member.

Instructional Literacy Coach (ILC): Facilitate RTI/MTSS core meetings, develop Tier II and III academic plans, gather data on student academics, conduct classroom observations, participate in gap analysis, file RtI paperwork, update RtI database, review school-wide progress monitoring, conduct lessons on determined needs and update staff on progress monitoring and interventions, fidelity checks, FLKRS assessment for kindergarten, coordinates professional development and in-service points through SunGard.

School Counselor: MTSS & Core team member, gifted paperwork coordinator, 504 coordinator, ELL coordinator, grade and subject acceleration facilitator, co-testing coordinator for FSA, iReady, and EOC's, Character Counts celebrations, crisis support, social skills/conflict resolution groups, support for students with economic needs, and student supervision duties as assigned.

School Psychologist: Support RtI/MTSS core meetings, facilitate gap analysis, file RtI paperwork, update RtI data base, develop Tier II and III behavioral plans, gather data on student behavior, conduct classroom observations, participate in gap analysis, update RtI database, review school-wide progress monitoring, participate in parent conferences, conduct student assessments as needed, finalize RtI packet and give to LEA.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

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

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	6	4	8	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	2	6	4	8	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Over the last three years, students in the lowest quartile have consistently performed below the school average in learning gains and proficiency in ELA.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

In 2015-2016, student proficiency in ELA and Science equaled 88%.
 In 2016-2017, student proficiency in ELA and Science equaled 86%.
 In 2017-2018, student proficiency in ELA was 87% while Science proficiency dropped to 82%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Our overall ELA learning gains and gains for students in the lowest quartile were 10% higher than the state average. Our proficiency data in the areas of ELA, Mathematics, and Science were 30% higher than the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Students identified in our lowest quartile in the area of Mathematics improved by 10% from the previous year. However, the data has not demonstrated a consistent upward trend over time.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Teachers met every six weeks to identify essential standards and differentiate instruction in the area of Mathematics.

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	87%	72%	56%	88%	68%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	59%	55%	67%	59%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	50%	48%	63%	53%	46%
Math Achievement	92%	77%	62%	92%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	76%	67%	59%	72%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	58%	47%	65%	60%	46%
Science Achievement	82%	68%	55%	88%	66%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (2)	8 (6)	1 (4)	1 (8)	0 (3)	4 (7)	15 (30)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	4 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (2)	3 (1)	7 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	2 (9)	10 (15)	13 (25)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	91%	78%	13%	57%	34%
	2017	90%	80%	10%	58%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	84%	74%	10%	56%	28%
	2017	81%	74%	7%	56%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2018	87%	73%	14%	55%	32%
	2017	84%	75%	9%	53%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	94%	80%	14%	62%	32%
	2017	91%	80%	11%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2018	91%	83%	8%	62%	29%
	2017	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	87%	79%	8%	61%	26%
	2017	90%	80%	10%	57%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	80%	73%	7%	55%	25%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	67	55	44	74	66	64	54				
ASN	95	65		97	90		100				
HSP	75	56		100	67						
MUL	95	77		95	92						
WHT	87	66	57	91	75	72	82				
FRL	73	50		73	57						

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	63	46	41	71	61	48	63				
ASN	95	69		100	77						
HSP	88	83		92	83		82				
MUL	83			92							
WHT	85	61	48	90	70	61	87				
FRL	67	55	50	70	70	50	60				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Teachers will collaborate in Professional Learning Communities to analyze current data, identify essential standards, develop common assessments that support a deeper level of rigor and develop targeted differentiated instruction in ELA.
Rationale	If we deliver effective instruction using current data to meet the needs of all students, then we will increase learning gains and overall proficiency in ELA.
Intended Outcome	Our goal is to increase our overall proficiency by 3% in ELA by focusing on learning gains for all students through the use of common assessments and targeted differentiated instruction as measured by the FSA in 2019.
Point Person	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description	Every teacher collaborates within the PLC to develop and administer common, formative and summative assessments to guide real-time instruction. All assessments administered are aligned with state standards, consistent in format and rigor with those used by other teachers in the PLC. Teachers are assessing student learning on a consistent and equitable basis. Teachers use results from common assessments to make decisions for future changes in content, instruction, and assessments. Teachers will plan for students to receive extra support and enrichment opportunities. All students are guaranteed access to this systematic intervention regardless of the teacher to whom they are assigned. There will be an additional focus on the implementation and effectiveness of an assigned intervention/enrichment block built into the master schedule.
Person Responsible	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	PLC teams meet 80 minutes each week to focus on students' learning gains in the areas of ELA and Mathematics through targeted and differentiated instruction. Teams post weekly meeting agendas, minutes, and student data on OPE-PLC OneNote Notebook. This digital tool allows administration to monitor the PLC process in real time and provides a platform for teams to share data, assessments, and instructional practices with other grade levels.
Person Responsible	Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Students will be recognized for demonstrating good character through our school-wide Positive Behavior System (PBS).
Rationale	Through PBS, teachers and staff are modeling and teaching school-wide behavior expectations to foster a positive learning environment, maximize instructional minutes, and reward students for demonstrating the six Pillars of Character: Citizenship, Responsibility, Trustworthiness, Fairness, Caring and Respect.
Intended Outcome	Staff actively monitors student's behavior rewarding them with positive PAWS, verbal praise, and/or redirecting student behavior as needed to foster student-teacher and student-student relationships.
Point Person	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	All staff members will distribute Positive PAWS to students who follow school-wide expectations and the six Pillars of Character. Students submit their Positive PAWS to the library weekly to be entered into a grade level raffle. Every week two students from each grade level are recognized on the news for their behavior. These students receive SWAG tags in recognition of their achievement. As an additional incentive, five students from every grade level are selected to go to the Otter Outpost school store. Students are also recognized for their leadership and positive behavior through our Character Counts recognition program. One student from each class is selected each month to receive a Character Counts award and attend our Character Counts assembly.
Person Responsible	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the system through observation and discipline data. During classroom visits administration will be looking for the following strategies to promote positive behavior: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View behaviors like academics – something to be taught • Focus on changing and teaching behavior • Focus on effective prevention • Positive climate (Teacher-student relationship) • Teachers directly instruct and model behavior expectations and rules • Classroom rules and expectations are posted in the classroom • Teachers establish routines and procedures
Person Responsible	Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3

Title Teachers will collaborate in Professional Learning Communities to analyze current data, identify essential standards, develop common assessments that support a deeper level of rigor and develop targeted differentiated instruction in Mathematics.

Rationale If we deliver effective instruction using current data to meet the needs of all students, then we will increase learning gains and over proficiency in Mathematics.

Intended Outcome Our goal is to increase our overall proficiency by 3% Mathematics by focusing on learning gains for all students through the use of common assessments and targeted differentiated instruction as measured by the FSA in 2019.

Point Person Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description Every teacher collaborates within the PLC to develop and administer common, formative and summative assessments to guide real-time instruction. All assessments administered are aligned with state standards, consistent in format and rigor with those used by other teachers in the PLC. Teachers are assessing student learning on a consistent and equitable basis. Teachers use results from common assessments to make decisions for future changes in content, instruction, and assessments. Teachers will plan for students to receive extra support and enrichment opportunities. All students are guaranteed access to this systematic intervention regardless of the teacher to whom they are assigned. There will be an additional focus on the implementation and effectiveness of an assigned intervention/enrichment block built into the master schedule.

Person Responsible Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description PLC teams meet 80 minutes each week to focus on students' learning gains in the areas of ELA and Mathematics through targeted and differentiated instruction. Teams post weekly meeting agendas, minutes, and student data on OPE-PLC OneNote Notebook. This digital tool allows administration to monitor the PLC process in real time and provides a platform for teams to share data, assessments, and instructional practices with other grade levels.

Person Responsible Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)