S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://sbj.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Mary Taylor

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2017

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: C (52%)
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 is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://sbj.oneclay.net

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 PK-6	Yes	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

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.

S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School, staffed by highly-qualified teachers, will establish an open, caring, and safe environment which promotes maximum achievement, while challenging our scholars to meet today and tomorrow as happy, healthy, successful, and accountable individuals.

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

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Hagen, Ilona	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Hagen is the SAC chair and 6th grade team leader who ensures all stakeholders have a voice when creating the School Improvement Plan.
Jones, LeAnne	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Jones is the Title I instructional coach. She is focuses on all data sources and coaches teachers and paraprofessionals in best practices for increasing learning outcomes. As the Lead Teacher, she also maintains Title I documentation.
Taylor, Mary	Principal	As the principal of S. Bryan Jennings Elementary, 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 opportunity. She is responsible for the implementation of all state, district, and school initiatives.
Gleneski, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Gleneski is a Title I intervention teacher, as well as the Intervention Team Facilitator.

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	65	73	65	65	64	63	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	11	10	11	10	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/6/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	3	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	3	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	58%	65%	57%	63%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	62%	58%	67%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	66%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	70%	63%	58%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	66%	62%	60%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	56%	51%	53%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	65%	53%	62%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	65 (0)	73 (0)	65 (0)	65 (0)	64 (0)	63 (0)	74 (0)	469 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	5 (3)	3 (4)	10 (11)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	5 (2)	3 (3)	9 (6)

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	67%	68%	-1%	58%	9%
	2018	57%	68%	-11%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	64%	-7%	58%	-1%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	51%	62%	-11%	56%	-5%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	55%	64%	-9%	54%	1%
	2018	60%	63%	-3%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	71%	-8%	62%	1%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%
	2018	57%	66%	-9%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
	2018	61%	65%	-4%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
06	2019	53%	70%	-17%	55%	-2%
	2018	65%	68%	-3%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	63%	-1%	53%	9%
	2018	56%	64%	-8%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	39	48	43	50	47	29	41				
ELL	30	47		45	50		30				
BLK	41	45	45	56	49	27	41				
HSP	62	53		54	59	67	70				
MUL	50	42		64	58						
WHT	67	59	47	71	62	30	68				
FRL	52	51	56	60	52	35	62				

	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	43	43	22	48	50	21	33				
ELL				64							
BLK	46	60	69	59	61	44	42				
HSP	56	55		62	61						
MUL	65	56		78	79						
WHT	67	49	24	70	71	48	58				
FRL	57	59	36	65	65	47	49				

	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	57	68	63	52	54	53	46				
BLK	48	67	69	48	61	57					
HSP	64	71		51	69						
MUL	60	60		60	55						
WHT	71	65	67	65	56	50	66				
FRL	61	71	70	55	56	48	66				

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	57
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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	43
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	61
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	54
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	58
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	56
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.

The component performing the lowest on the 2019 FSA at S. Bryan Jennings is the proficiency of the Lowest Quartile in Math, with 37%. This data is substantiated with the scores from i-Ready where most students in this group scored well below grade level. This data may reflect a downward trend as the same group performed at 48% in 2018. Intensive intervention with these scholars will be crucial.

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

Not surprisingly based upon the above, the component which showed the greatest decline from the 2018 FSA was Math Learning Gains which dropped from 69% in 2018 to 57% in 2019. This decline may be due to the implementation of a new math curriculum in the 2018-2019 school year. As prerequisite skills are strengthened, proficiency should increase.

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 component which showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the Lowest Quartile in Math. Contributing factors are likely the implementation of the new curriculum, as well as lack of basic math facts necessary for grade level proficiency. At this point, no trends appear to exist.

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

The component which showed the most improvement on the 2019 FSA was the Lowest Quartile in English and Language Arts, which saw an increase from 36% in 2018 to 49% in 2019; this reflects an increase of 13%. Contributing actions include a change of curriculum and focused intensive groups for students at all levels of proficiency.

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

Attendance continues to be an area of concern.

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

1. Improving learning gains in math
2. Improving attendance
3. Increasing ELA proficiency
4. Supporting PBIS through the 7 Mindsets curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	Students must be able to comprehend and apply mathematical concepts, operations, and relations accurately and efficiently in order to become skilled problem solvers.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SBJ scored 63% proficient for math achievement on the 2018-2019 FSA and will increase at least 10% on the 2019-2020 assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	If all teachers implement small group instruction that is differentiated and data driven with research based interventions (i-Ready), then we will increase student learning gains in mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows differentiated instruction helps close learning gaps and increase proficiency. Utilizing i-Ready data, instructional grouping profiles, and Tools for Instruction gives teacher the resources to help close achievement gaps. Additionally, teachers who attend Intel professional development will increase their own math content knowledge, which will increase student learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	1. Eureka training for all math teachers 2. Professional development regarding small group differentiated instruction 3. Data analysis to form small groups 4. On-going analysis of data to insure fluid small groups 5. Intel training for identified teachers 6. Support of small group instruction by Title I staff
Person Responsible	Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	English and Language Arts
Rationale	Students must be proficient in English and Language Arts to succeed in all aspects of grade level curriculum.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SBJ scored 58% proficient in ELA on the 2018-2019 FSA and will increase by 10% to at least 68% on the 2019-2020 assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students in Grades 4-6 will utilize the Read, Discuss, Read strategy along with Achieve 3000 articles in conjunction with LAFS curriculum. Students in grades K-3 will utilize the LAFS curriculum along with i-Ready computer based instruction, SIPPS, and LLI to increase foundational skills necessary for the reading of complex texts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing the strategies defined will result in increased reading proficiency. Basic reading skills will be strengthened allowing for the inclusion and understanding of complex texts in all content areas.

Action Step	
Description	1. professional development in Read, Discuss, Read strategy, Achieve 3000, i-Ready, and LAFS 2. monitoring of instruction through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, and on-going data review 3. inclusion of complex text in content areas of science and social studies 4. coaching cycles for identified teachers (Title I coach, district curriculum specialists) 5. support of small group instruction by Title I staff
Person Responsible	Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

#3	
Title	Positive Behavior System (PBIS)
Rationale	Common expectations for positive behavior throughout the school will decrease disruptive behaviors and increase student learning.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In an effort to emphasize positive behaviors, we have implemented a Pawsitive Office Referral initiative whereby students are recognized for exemplary behavior. We expect to recognize at least 25% of our students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	If the 7 Mindsets curriculum is embedded into classrooms to support PBIS, then student engagement and ownership will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If all teachers establish a classroom community to support the Positive Behavior System (PBIS) , then student engagement and ownership in their educational goals will increase. SBJ has a PBIS vertical team which supports staff with positive behavior goals. Professional development will be given in CHAMPS along with behavioral de-escalation techniques. All faculty and staff will support PBIS by giving pawsitive reward tickets, and by acknowledging exemplary behavior with a Pawsitive Office Referral.

Action Step	
Description	1. professional development on 7 Mindsets, CHAMPS, and behavioral de-escalation techniques 2. create Pawsitive Office Referral form 3. acquire Pawsitive referral incentives 4. implementation of 7 Mindsets campus wide 5. develop/acquire signage for PBIS
Person Responsible	Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

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).

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, Â§ 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.

SBJ is creating a Parent Volunteer Organization to help train parents to give positive support to their child's education. We will host our annual Parent Night, Literacy Night, Math Night, Orientation/Open House, along with monthly grade level curriculum discussions, and other opportunities for stakeholders to support the needs of SBJ. The SBJ School Improvement Plan, along with the Parent and Family Engagement Plan, is developed and reviewed yearly with parent, teacher, and community input and is made available to LEA, parents, and the public in an easy to read printed format at the front desk of SBJ and on the SBJ website.

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.

S. Bryan Jennings has a full time school counselor who is available to speak with scholars and parents. She also creates and presents lessons to each of the classrooms to encourage growth in character. She is a source for names and agencies to assist parents in need. SBJ has a social worker who makes home visits to monitor at risk students. Carnell Penn, SBJ Physical Education Teacher, with Jacob Hagen, former professional football player and SBJ alum, created a mentoring program known as Jaguar Brotherhood. This program assists the students in developing appropriate social skills, anti-bullying strategies, and provides academic support to 5th and 6th grade boys. Mrs. Hagen and Mrs. Ruckersfeldt have continued Jag Jewels, an after school club which provides support with developing strategies to manage peer pressure, develop social skills, and appropriate comportment for 6th grade girls. We are fortunate to be participating in Right Path counseling as another opportunity to assist identified at risk students. Additionally, we have had a number of teachers and staff to become certified in Youth Mental Health First Aid. Use of the 7 Mindsets curriculum will contribute to the overall wellness of our students.

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

SBJ encourages local preschool programs to visit our school in the spring and spend time in a Kindergarten classroom. Kindergarten also provides a staggered enrollment. Pre-k and Kindergarten teachers meet to discuss upcoming student IEPs and screenings. Orange Park Junior High Administrators visit to discuss expectations regarding behavior, dress codes, and rules, along with explaining the rotating schedule and electives. The SBJ 6th grade teachers incorporate Junior High rules into their classrooms such as higher expectations of responsibility, and increased ownership of their learning on the scholars.

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.

The leadership team analyzes data from i-Ready, and Achieve 3000 with each team after every diagnostic and growth monitoring assessment to identify grade level strengths and weaknesses, as well as school trends. Based on these findings, we work with grade levels, individual teachers, and paraprofessionals providing professional development to strengthen areas of concern. We also identify at-risk scholars and discuss the plan of action, including the MTSS process, extended day services and small group differentiation. During weekly team meetings, we discuss the progress of the interventions put in place for teachers, grade levels, and/or individual scholars to ensure appropriate progress is being

made.

SBJ utilizes all resources to provide each scholar with a well-rounded education. We have three Exceptional Student Educators providing services to our ESE scholars meeting the goals of the IDEA, an Extended Services teacher for our gifted scholars, and many of our teachers are cross-certified in exceptional education. SBJ provides a bi-lingual paraprofessional to meet the needs of our English Language Learners. We use our additional funds to provide more assistance to our scholars in terms of enrichment programs, classroom assistants, feeding programs, and up-to-date educational materials, including technology resources. We received additional Chrome Books for the K-2nd grades through Title 1 funds.

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

SBJ invites speakers to share about their careers frequently. Our teachers are encouraged to wear their college shirts and speak about the colleges they have attended, as well as displaying their credentials in a visible location. SBJ business partners are invited to volunteer and/or attend all school sponsored activities.