
Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Plantation Oaks Elementary School

4150 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://poe.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Marks

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (70%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| ESSA Status | TS&I |
|--|------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Plantation Oaks Elementary School

4150 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://poe.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">46%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">65%</p> |

School Grades History

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

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.

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

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|-----------|---|
| Lee, Chastity | 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, 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 assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------|--|
| Henderson, Amy | 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. 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 judgement 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. |

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 | 130 | 124 | 143 | 124 | 149 | 135 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 961 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 | |
| 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 | 20 | 24 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |

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 | |

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 | | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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)

50

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 63% | 65% | 57% | 71% | 62% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 62% | 58% | 58% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 54% | 53% | 50% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 70% | 63% | 78% | 64% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 58% | 66% | 62% | 59% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 56% | 51% | 50% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 47% | 65% | 53% | 50% | 55% | 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 | 130 (0) | 124 (0) | 143 (0) | 124 (0) | 149 (0) | 135 (0) | 805 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 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) | 20 (0) | 24 (0) | 44 (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 | 71% | 68% | 3% | 58% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 68% | 10% | 57% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 69% | 64% | 5% | 58% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 62% | 11% | 56% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 54% | 62% | -8% | 56% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 59% | 2% | 55% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -19% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 74% | 71% | 3% | 62% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 70% | 15% | 62% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 75% | 69% | 6% | 64% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 66% | 13% | 62% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 48% | 64% | -16% | 60% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 65% | 4% | 61% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -21% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 48% | 63% | -15% | 53% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 64% | -2% | 55% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -14% | | | | |
| 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 | 30 | 35 | 34 | 42 | 44 | 35 | 35 | | | | |
| ELL | 55 | 51 | 40 | 52 | 56 | 40 | 38 | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | 59 | | 80 | 78 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 55 | 50 | 63 | 52 | 39 | 37 | | | | |
| HSP | 65 | 52 | 40 | 65 | 50 | 18 | 48 | | | | |
| MUL | 56 | 44 | | 61 | 46 | | 30 | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 62 | 48 | 76 | 67 | 65 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 54 | 44 | 63 | 57 | 43 | 41 | | | | |
| 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 | 39 | 32 | 55 | 58 | 49 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 56 | 62 | | 63 | 56 | 43 | 60 | | | | |
| ASN | 79 | 84 | | 85 | 70 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 64 | 46 | 20 | 70 | 54 | 42 | 51 | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | 59 | 41 | 79 | 58 | 37 | 69 | | | | |
| MUL | 83 | 63 | | 90 | 72 | | 67 | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 62 | 45 | 84 | 66 | 50 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 50 | 28 | 72 | 55 | 39 | 54 | | | | |
| 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 | 43 | 36 | 38 | 48 | 41 | 39 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 56 | 44 | 30 | 72 | 56 | | 25 | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 68 | | 91 | 77 | | 71 | | | | |
| BLK | 64 | 54 | 49 | 70 | 55 | 47 | 32 | | | | |
| HSP | 72 | 62 | 50 | 74 | 59 | 40 | 54 | | | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 70 | 53 | | 78 | 68 | | 33 | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 58 | 54 | 82 | 58 | 53 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 48 | 43 | 69 | 55 | 46 | 30 | | | | |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 432 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 48 |
| 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 | 73 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 50 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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.

Students with Disabilities had the lowest performance with an overall index of 36%. The data indicates that students with disabilities in our bottom quartile for ELA and our Hispanic subgroup for the bottom quartile in learning gains for Math are the most affected. Plantation Oaks Elementary had seven self contained units for students with varying disabilities and a high population of inclusion students which, according to the data, several of these students are in the bottom quartile and are reflected in the above data.

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

Students with Disabilities showed the greatest decline from the prior year. POE received a new population of students from rezoning including addition of self contained units and the loss of student population due to the opening of a new 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.

When compared to the state average, POE had the greatest gap in ELA lowest 25th percentile and Math lowest 25th percentile. POE received a new population of students from rezoning including addition of self contained units and the loss of student population due to the opening of a new school.

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

POE's ELA overall learning gains showed the most improvement. We implemented the LAFS curriculum and used iReady toolbox for small group instruction.

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

Our areas of concern include our ELA lowest 25th percentile and Math lowest 25th percentile.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. ELA lowest 25th percentile
3. Math lowest 25th percentile
4. Science overall achievement
5. Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| #1 | |
| Title | Extended Common Planning |
| Rationale | Teachers will engage in monthly extended planning by grade and subject taught, including POE's teachers of self contained units. During this planning, teachers will review/discuss individual student data, grade level data, and school improvement goals; share problems of practice, to include student misconceptions, corrective instruction needs; and create assessments. |

| | |
|---|--|
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | POE's goal is to increase Students with Disabilities Overall Achievement to 37%, ELA lower quartile gains to 44%, Math lower quartile gains to 45%, and Science overall achievement to 48%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Chastity Lee (chastity.lee@myoneclay.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Identify student needs, select relevant grade appropriate curriculum and resources, plan for implementation, implement lesson, review, and reflect. Student work samples, student assessment samples, lesson plans, data spreadsheet, and district assessment results. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our evidence-based strategy is a conceptual framework for teachers to have collegial conversations and tangible evidence of student growth. |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a common planning schedule. 2. Create data wall. 3. 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | Chastity Lee (chastity.lee@myoneclay.net) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #2 | |
| Title | Small Group Instruction |
| Rationale | Teachers will use small group instruction to differentiate based on student data and need. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | POE's goal is to increase Students with Disabilities Overall Achievement to 37%, ELA lower quartile gains to 44%, Math lower quartile gains to 45%, and Science overall achievement to 48%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Chastity Lee (chastity.lee@myoneclay.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Teachers will utilize iReady toolbox, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to review and remediate. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Differentiated instruction is vital to closing student learning gaps. Teachers will collaborate with their peers during common planning to discuss problems of practice. Professional Development Opportunities will be provided during PLC's. District Curriculum Specialists will be actively involved in Learning Walks and Professional Development Opportunities. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common Planning 2. Provide iReady Toolbox 3. Professional Development Opportunities during PLC 4. Utilize District Curriculum Specialists 5. |
| Person Responsible | Chastity Lee (chastity.lee@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).

The remaining schoolwide improvement priorities will be covered using Social Emotional Learning through guidance lessons, parental involvement opportunities, and community outreach.

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.

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