

Clay County Schools

Doctors Inlet Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Carolyn Ayers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: B (61%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.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	No	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

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

Doctors Inlet Elementary School's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, rigorous, engaging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing learning opportunities that are real world relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment build upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individually responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Doctors Inlet Elementary school exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring life skills.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ayers, Carolyn	Principal	
Mineo, Kristi	Assistant Principal	
Long, Hannah	Teacher, K-12	
Wellons, Techla	Teacher, K-12	
Harrison , Kristen	Teacher, K-12	
Lang, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Hansen, Missy	Teacher, K-12	
Bohn, Laura	Teacher, ESE	
Forbis, Allyson	Teacher, K-12	
Reinhart, Salli	Teacher, K-12	

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	79	77	77	95	86	91	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	10	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	1	39	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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)

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/5/2019

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	10	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	6	8	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	1	39	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	3	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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%	65%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	62%	58%	61%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	53%	61%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	70%	63%	64%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	66%	62%	55%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	51%	49%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	65%	53%	69%	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	79 (0)	77 (0)	77 (0)	95 (0)	86 (0)	91 (0)	107 (0)	612 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 ()	2 ()	2 ()	2 ()	2 ()	1 ()	0 ()	19 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	39 (0)	15 (0)	59 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	12 (0)	15 (0)	32 (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	61%	68%	-7%	58%	3%
	2018	66%	68%	-2%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
	2018	54%	62%	-8%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	57%	62%	-5%	56%	1%
	2018	68%	59%	9%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	76%	64%	12%	54%	22%
	2018	74%	63%	11%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	71%	2%	62%	11%
	2018	72%	70%	2%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
	2018	55%	66%	-11%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	70%	64%	6%	60%	10%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
06	2019	74%	70%	4%	55%	19%
	2018	83%	68%	15%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	63%	-8%	53%	2%
	2018	63%	64%	-1%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	57	63	65	76	47	41				
ELL	53	42		63	77						
ASN	90			100							
BLK	47	56	54	51	59	38	31				

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
HSP	57	70		67	50						
MUL	50	36		61	64						
WHT	67	63	57	76	73	64	63				
FRL	50	52	55	70	73	61	40				
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	45	51	38	53	59	46	43				
ELL	54			38							
ASN	100			90							
BLK	55	66	50	61	53	58	45				
HSP	49	64	60	63	72		67				
MUL	50	40		55	47						
WHT	72	63	40	74	67	57	70				
FRL	63	61	45	69	64	59	60				
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	33	46	56	41	39	33	47				
ELL	42			58							
BLK	44	50	50	50	44	33	50				
HSP	64	57		54	43	30					
MUL	39	40		54	55						
WHT	72	67	72	69	60	64	76				
FRL	58	61	60	58	49	40	60				

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	62
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
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	59
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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	53
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	66
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	57
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.

Last year's performance Science scored the lowest for proficiency at 55%. This was a 12 point drop from the previous year. There are several contributing factors to why this drop happened. We had a new Science curriculum and teachers were unfamiliar with the usage and where to find the content of the previous years. We determined there was a lack of Science vocabulary knowledge for students coming into 5th grade. There was also a high population of ESE students who struggled to read grade level Science content and couldn't decipher what the questions were asking.

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

Science was the greatest decline from the previous year. It dropped 12 points. Several factors affect the outcome of 5th grade Science test. Students are tested on 3 years worth of standards in 5th grade, we have identified the lack of Science vocabulary knowledge, application in classes, and student engagement with Science as factors that prevented proficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Lowest Quartile Learning gains in reading. Some of our students come to us several grade levels behind in reading and have to make great gains in order to be able to read grade level material. We have noticed trends with the students we receive from out of county, they come to us not on grade level. Teachers spend time in small groups and using intervention programs to close the academic gaps for these students.

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

The area that showed that most improvement from last year to this year was for our Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in Reading. We went from 44% to 58% which is an increase of 14. We did this by targeted small group instruction, using LLI, SIPPS, Achieve 3000, and i Ready LAFS with students.

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

Student attendance is an area of concern. We have implemented the HOT class of the week for students who are here and on time. Each quarter we celebrate the grade level with the highest attendance and reward them through a student chosen activity or reward.

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

1. Increasing Science Proficiency
2. Overall Reading Proficiency
3. Overall Reading Learning Gains
4. Lowest quartile Math Learning Gains
5. Social Emotional Learning and Heath for students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Science
Rationale	5th grade Science Scores dropped 8% points and from 207 to 203 mean score.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	63% proficiency on the SSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom teachers will incorporate Science vocabulary
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2

Title Reading Lowest Quartile Learning Gains**Rationale**

Even though we increased our scores significantly for learning gains with our lower quartile last year. We need to continue to push in this area because we had dropped significantly the year before. We are still behind the district and state average for these areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Based on the 2019 FSA data, lowest quartile students will improve their reading learning gains by 5% based on FSA 2020 scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

LAFS Interventions, LLI, SIPPS & SIPPS challenge, iReady Reading. Small group instruction and best teaching strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Looking at the gains we made last year we based our plan around the data and are starting interventions and programs earlier on in the year versus in January. This will help students close the academic gaps and make learning gains in reading. Evidence based on FSA data 2019, Diagnostic 1 data from iReady Reading, Achieve 3000 baseline, and BAS scores.

Action Step**Description**

1. Identify BAS level for students (September)
2. Implement LLI, SIPPS, iReady for students (small group targeted instruction)
3. D2 Testing window to adjust and readdress small groups for students
4. Achieve 3000 & Lexile Gains tracking for students (4-6th grade)
5. Before School Tutoring Feb - April

Person Responsible

Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@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).

Based on Science assessment data from May 2019; Students will improve in the area of Science proficiency by 5% by May 2020. Students scored 55% proficiency on the 2019 assessment.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Lowest Quartile Learning Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00