Seabreeze Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze

Demographics

Principal: Aimee Kimball

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Seabreeze Elementary, we aspire to build a foundation for lifelong learning by fostering individual growth. We provide unique opportunities for developing leadership skills, critical thinking, and creative expression. We want our Seahorses empowered, prepared and fulfilled.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seabreeze Elementary strives to provide a positive, engaging and thoughtful environment that will reach the whole child every day.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kimball, Aimee	Principal	ALL
Romer, Rebekah	Teacher, ESE	Gifted Education
Reimer, Kathleen	Instructional Technology	5th Grade ELA
Troy, Ronrica	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline and Assessment Data
Crenshaw, Addison	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Begnoche, Kelly	School Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	102	79	73	92	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
36

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

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

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	75%	50%	57%	63%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	56%	58%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	35%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	62%	63%	80%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	63%	62%	72%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	51%	55%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	48%	53%	73%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
Number of students enrolled	92 (0)	102 (0)	79 (0)	73 (0)	92 (0)	87 (0)	525 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	3 ()	7 ()	10 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 ()	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)

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

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

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
	2018	65%	49%	16%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	72%	50%	22%	56%	16%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
	2018	76%	59%	17%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
	2018	78%	60%	18%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	77%	57%	20%	60%	17%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	49%	13%	53%	9%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	40	69	63	44	72	71	29				
ELL											
BLK	52	65	60	55	77	82	31				
HSP	81	83		81	83						
MUL	86	80		79	70						
WHT	79	71	52	83	78	64	71				
FRL	62	70	70	66	77	70	47				
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	41	38	31	50	57	42					

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
BLK	37	38	40	49	48	50	50				
HSP	61	60		78	60						
MUL	44			56							
WHT	79	56	31	83	66	42	79				
FRL	50	37	28	63	59	45	52				

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	35	39	27	58	56	53	33				
ASN	70			100							
BLK	36	40	23	52	64	53	31				
HSP	50			81							
MUL	60	50		75	60						
WHT	71	53	50	86	75	58	81				
FRL	41	41	28	63	62	45	64				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	576
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	83
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	82
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Our lowest performance area is Reading Least Performing Quartile. It should be noted that this component improved 30 points from the year prior. We utilized all instructional support personnel to push in and provide academic interventions.

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

The only component with an area of decline is the area of Science Proficiency. Science has declined the last three years. Factors leading to this decline include lack of fidelity in primary grades and gaps in instruction.

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 largest gap is in the component of Reading proficiency. Seabreeze Elementary, at 75%, was 18 points higher than the state average.

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

The data component with the most improvement is the area of Least Performing Quartile Gains in the subject of Reading.

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

We have two areas of concern. We have ten children whose attendance has fallen below 90%. We also have ten children that scored a Level 1 of the FSA state assessment.

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

1. Science achievement: expected goal is to achieve 70% or higher in Science proficiency
2. Maintaining our school grade without any areas of decline
3. Improving culture and climate data as evidenced by our 5Essentials survey
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Improve Science Proficiency
Rationale	Due to the consistent historical decline, Seabreeze Elementary will focus on improving Science proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science proficiency will improve to at least 70%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Seabreeze Elementary will incorporate brain-based Thinking Maps professional development, integrating the material with each grade level's Science curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers are in Year 2 of implementation for this program, and are eager to apply it across the content areas.

Action Step

Description	1. Meet monthly to plan and prepare engaging Science lessons through the use of Thinking Maps. 2. Incorporate enrichment extension lessons through the use of a Science Lab, Community Education programs, and Extended Day programs. 3. Engage stakeholders in supporting our STEM program and funding our Science Lab year round. 4. Track Baseline data and track growth throughout instruction through use of PMAs 5. Monitor and reward use of Penda online lessons.
Person Responsible	Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

We will focus on maintenance of other school grade components by continuing to implement interventions with fidelity. We will follow the MTSS guidelines, use data to track the effectiveness of programs, and monitor classroom instruction and intervention. For culture and climate, school leadership will focus on team building exercises, opportunities for empowerment and building relationships. The goal is to align our resources, mission, and people towards a common collective good.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

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

N/A

PFEP Link

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve Science Proficiency				$4,232.12
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	2251 - Seabreeze Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	36.0	$4,232.12
			Notes: Pending SAC Approval, these funds will be spent on intervention programs for Math, Science, and English/Language arts.			
					Total:	$8,464.24