

Hernando County School District

John D. Floyd Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

John D. Floyd Elementary School

3139 DUMONT AVE, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/fes>

Demographics

Principal: Joyce Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 9/24/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

John D. Floyd Elementary School

3139 DUMONT AVE, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/fes>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

The mission of John D. Floyd Elementary School is to promote a partnership with students, parents, and the community by providing a supportive educational environment enhanced by technology that encourages problem solving and responsible choices, thus preparing all to meet tomorrow's challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Attitude Determines Altitude...

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
White, Elissa	Teacher, K-12	Attend the SBLT and represent 2nd grade. Bring data and be able to discuss it.
Anderson, Kara	Teacher, K-12	Attend SBLT for 1st grade.. Be able to discuss grade level data and students.
Lewis, Joyce	Principal	Facilitate meetings.
Tomlinson, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Discuss discipline data.
Rode, Wendi	Teacher, K-12	Attend SBLT for 1st grade.. Be able to discuss grade level data and students.
Jackson, Sid	School Counselor	Discuss parent concerns and incident reports.
Haripersad, Angelina	Administrative Support	Title I Lead Facilitator.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/24/2020, Joyce Lewis

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	141	151	161	172	160	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	914
Attendance below 90 percent	56	46	60	50	48	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	303
One or more suspensions	12	10	18	18	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	1	2	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	40	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	4	6	18	23	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	11	1	2	28	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	141	151	161	172	160	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	914
Attendance below 90 percent	56	46	60	50	48	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	303
One or more suspensions	12	10	18	18	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	1	2	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	40	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	4	6	18	23	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	11	1	2	28	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Students retained two or more times	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	57%	54%	57%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	53%	58%	43%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	53%	42%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	55%	58%	63%	51%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	29%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	51%	19%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	54%	53%	50%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	59%	-5%	58%	-4%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	54%	52%	2%	56%	-2%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
	2018	67%	67%	0%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	62%	-12%	64%	-14%
	2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	61%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	55%	-5%	53%	-3%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	22	54	60	25	43	45	25				
ELL	65	80		55	40						
BLK	56	62		39	65						
HSP	58	62	75	52	48	56	43				
MUL	57	50		43	50						
WHT	57	52	49	59	52	40	54				
FRL	49	50	49	49	46	45	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	23	55	58	33	30	43					
ELL	28	44		39	44						
BLK	48	60		42	40		50				
HSP	56	62	57	56	54	48	56				
MUL	59	53		52	45		64				
WHT	54	48	50	56	46	36	44				
FRL	51	49	44	52	43	34	45				
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	21	41	42	18	14	10	23				
ELL	29	36		29	25						
BLK	59	52		53	33		50				
HSP	44	41	41	38	26	28	44				
MUL	57	27		54	31						
WHT	55	44	43	55	29	13	53				

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
FRL	48	40	42	48	29	23	41				

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	53
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 subgroup with the lowest performance is our SWD. In 2018 23% of the students in ELA were proficient and in 2019 22% of the students were proficient. In math, 33% of the students were proficient in 2018 and 25% were proficient in 2019. Another factor is the lack of training to our Gen Ed

teachers in different methodologies to help SWD. Our SWD have traditionally scored much lower than Gen Ed students.

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

Our biggest decline from the 2018 school year is in math. When compared to 2018 3rd grade dropped 2% to 60%, 4th grade dropped 12% to 50% and 5th grade dropped 2% to 52%.

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 comparing JD Floyd to the state average, the largest gap was in Math Learning Gains. In 2019 the state 62% of the students in the state were proficient as compared to 52% at JD Floyd. While we are still 10% below the state average, we been steadily making improvements going up 5% in 2018.

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

The component that showed the most improvement are our ELL Students. In ELA our students went from 28% proficient in 2018 to 65% proficient. In math, our students went from 39% proficient in 2018 to 55% in 2019.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concerns using the EWS data is the number of students who were absent more than 10% of the school year. Currently 108 students are below 90% absences. Another area of concern as noted on the EWS is the number of students who scored a Level 1 on the state assessment at 126.

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

1. SWD student scoring 3 or higher on the ELA and Math FSA (22%)
2. 4th grade achievement level on the math FSA (50%)
3. Students who are absent 10 or more percent of the year. (108)
4. Math learning gains for all students. (52%)
5. Bottom quartile students showing learning gains in math. (46%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our focus will be increasing math learning gains for all students by 3% for our students in grades in 3-5. Based on our district and state data, JD Floyd shows the greatest deficit in students making learning gains in math. JD Floyd only has 52% of our students making adequate progress, where the state was at 62% and the district is at 57%. While we improved 5% points on the 2019 FSA test, we are still below state and district level.
Measurable Outcome:	JD Floyd 3-5 grade student will increase learning gains in math by 3% which will help close the gap between district and state averages.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. iReady Math Custom courses using the Teacher Toolbox 2. Math resource teacher pulling Tier III students 3. Differentiation during small group instruction and dedicated MTSS time. 4. District math support will provide PD on differentiation math small groups. 5. Quarterly data change to discuss student data focusing on SWD and bottom quartile students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Using iReady Diagnostic, teachers will create custom course to ensure the students specific weakness are being addressed. 2. Teachers will provide differentiated instruction using data from iReady, benchmarks and formatives. 3. Teachers will use the iReady toolbox to provide differentiated standards based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Share disaggregated math data with teachers and build small groups based on iReady data.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

2. Monitor iReady data to ensure students are receiving the necessary time as outlined by iReady protocol.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

3. Meet monthly with math teachers to review classroom data (benchmarks, formatives) and iReady data.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

4. Meet quarterly for data chats with a focus on the bottom quartile and how they are performing in MTSS.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

5. Provide paras to assist with Tier II remediation allowing teachers to pull more Tier III groups. This will be monitored through MTSS logs documenting the standards addressed.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

1. Share disaggregated math data with teachers and build small groups based on iReady data.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

2. Monitor iReady data to ensure students are receiving the necessary time as outlined by iReady protocol.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

3. Meet monthly with math teachers to review classroom data (benchmarks, formatives) and iReady data.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

4. Meet quarterly for data chats with a focus on the bottom quartile and how they are performing in MTSS.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

5. Provide paras to assist with Tier II remediation allowing teachers to pull more Tier III groups. This will be monitored through MTSS logs documenting the standards addressed.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our focus will be on creating positive relationships with families in order to improve student behavior. In the 2018-2019 school year, 11% of our students received 1 or more suspensions. We would like to decrease this by 2% to 9% for the 2020-2021 school year. By reducing the number of suspensions, students will spend more time in classroom for instruction which increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome: We would like to decrease students getting one or more suspensions from 11% in the 2018-2019 school year to 9% for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students who are having behavioral problem in class will be identified by their classroom teachers and pulled in to small social groups with the guidance counselors.
2. Teachers will be trained in Zones of Regulation and how to implement it into their classroom
3. JD Floyd is a Gold PBIS school and we will continue to implement positive strategies to improve student behavior such as Club Splash, Splash Cards and Super Splash.
4. Students who received 2 or more ODR in the 2019-2020 school year will be assigned a "Champion". That person will do check ins with the students to discuss academics and behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We selected these strategies because it focuses on rewarding positive behavior and helping students better understand their feelings and how to control them. We chose the Champion strategy because research shows that students who have an adult they can confide in and look up to do a better job in both academics and behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Becky Jackson will train/review Zones of Regulations with Staff.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

2. Becky Jackson will review PBIS expectations with staff and students.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

3. Becky and Sid Jackson will pull students identified as having behavior problems into small groups.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

4. Students will be assigned "Champions" based on their discipline data from 2019-2020

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If staff focuses on rigorous standards based instruction, the student achievement will improve. We will increase proficiency or 3 or higher by 2% in ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	JD Floyd's achievement level will go up 2% in ELA from a 57% to a 59%. Our Math achievement level in Math will increase 2% from 55% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lesson planning checks 2. Lesson planning PD with our district reading coach 3. Administration walkthrough
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will check teachers lesson plans to ensure students are planning effective lessons to reach all students. 2. Our district reading coach will meet regularly with teams to assist teachers with planning effective lessons. 3. Administration will conduct regular walkthroughs with the teachers lesson plans to ensure the lesson being taught matches the lessons written.

Action Steps to Implement

1. District coaches will come in during team planning to assist teachers.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

2. Lesson plans will be turned in by Monday and evaluated by administrators. Conferences with teachers will occur to discuss lesson plans as needed.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

3. Teachers will be required to use iReady lesson plans during whole and small group instruction. This will be monitored through lesson plans and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

4. Walkthroughs will occur daily to ensure lessons being taught match lesson plans and standards. Conferences will be conducted with teachers who rate a Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

5. Data chats will occur monthly to ensure teachers are aware of where their students are and can adjust instruction.

Person Responsible Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The one remaining concern is attendance. We will address this concern by tracking attendance carefully, calling parents of students who are consistently absent and we will put whiteboards out at drop off and pick-up that will track attendance data.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At the beginning of every school year, we host an Open House where parents are invited to meet the teachers, visit classrooms and tour the campus. During this event representatives from PTA, SAC, STEAM and Boys and Girls club are among the many organizations available to talk with families. Our Volunteer Coordinator is also available to facilitate the volunteer process with parents and family members. Parents are kept informed of their child's progress on a daily basis via agenda's and weekly Chalk updates. Important information about school activities is also posted regularly on our Facebook page and included in the global phone message to all parents. PTA hosts many activities to support JD Floyd including skate nights, Holiday House, dances, social events, and Movie nights. Administration also hosts Pastry for Parents, Family math, ELA and science nights, chorus concerts and kindergarten shows.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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