Sallie Jones Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
mission
college and career
students
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
growth
supportive environment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sallie Jones Elementary School

1230 NARRANJA ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/sje

Demographics

Principal: Jennie Hoke

Start Date for this Principal: 2/21/2012

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)	88%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Sallie Jones Elementary School

1230 NARRANJA ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/sje

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	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

SJE Tigers will be innovative leaders striving for excellence through high expectations and a commitment to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Tomorrow's Leaders Today!

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
Hoke, Jennie	Principal	Principal: The principal serves as the instructional leader for the school. She co chairs the Partnership and Performance Committee and serves on our School Advisory Committee. She is also a member of our Literacy Leadership Team and heads up our Title One program initiatives. She also serves as a liaison to our PTO.
Gosser, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for parent and family communication through our School Messenger System. She also oversees school safety and facilities. She is a co chair of the SPPC, and a member of PPC, Literacy Leadership Team, Lighthouse Team, and a liaison to PTO and SAC. She assists with student discipline and parent conferences, and works with the school social worker to monitor attendance data and build relationships with students and families. She also assists the Lead Teacher in analyzing data and facilitating team meetings.
Buscemi, Tina	Instructional Coach	The Lead Teacher is an Instructional Coach who provides professional development in curricular and instructional areas. She provides coaching and mentoring to new as well as seasoned teachers. She facilitates team meetings and assists teachers in analyzing data and developing action plans with grade levels to assist with student achievement.
Imhoof, Patty	Psychologist	The Psychologist provides diagnostic testing analysis for individual students to track strengths and weaknesses. She work with our MTSS system during TST. She also creates BIPs for students struggling with behavior and supports teachers in implementing these plans.
Thomas, Shakira	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor serves as the head of our TST. She schedules and facilitates weekly meetings to track progress of struggling learners through the MTSS process. She also provides counseling services for students and families and serves as a liaison with community volunteers. She supports English Language Learners with curriculum resources and oversees WIDA testing for this population.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 2/21/2012, Jennie Hoke

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.*
4

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

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)	88%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	105	106	77	76	75	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
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	9	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Friday 9/4/2020

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	113	122	116	99	94	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	674
Attendance below 90 percent	0	28	23	19	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	18	30	32	30	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	113	122	116	99	94	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	674
Attendance below 90 percent	0	28	23	19	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	18	30	32	30	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	71%	62%	57%	74%	60%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	57%	58%	73%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	60%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	81%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	54%	62%	77%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	42%	51%	50%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	54%	53%	61%	55%	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	76%	69%	7%	58%	18%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
	2018	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	70%	10%	62%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	69%	11%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	60%	17%	64%	13%
	2018	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	72%	56%	16%	60%	12%
	2018	77%	62%	15%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	55%	2%
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	34	47	46	42	53	46	5				
ELL	27	45		47	57						
BLK	33	42	36	48	47	40	7				
HSP	70	67	53	74	67	40	57				
MUL	48	63		61	75						
WHT	81	71	56	85	78	64	60				
FRL	60	62	47	65	65	46	38				
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	18	41	41	34	50	47	17				
ELL	30			58							
BLK	31	18		58	47						
HSP	66	60	27	69	72	64	52				
MUL	57	46		67	54						
WHT	70	54	43	86	78	52	63				
FRL	53	47	29	71	64	41	56				

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	29	49	45	38	53	34	27				
BLK	44	57		68	67						
HSP	68	67	45	72	67	44	47				
MUL	58	80		74	90						
WHT	81	76	64	86	81	50	68				
FRL	67	71	66	78	75	53	54				

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	43
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	62
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	71
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	53
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.

FSA data from the 2018-19 school year indicates growth needed in math and reading learning gains for the lower 25% and science proficiency. Also, student subgroups of black and students with disabilities fell below 41% when combining all seven areas. We have no FSA data for the 2019-2020 school year so will be continuing our focus areas for this school year.

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

The only area which showed a decline was in the area of science which declined 8%. Contributing factors include, expertise in science instruction, attention to the standards, and lacking a whole school science focus.

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 biggest gap as compared to the state average was Reading Learning Gains for the lowest 25% in grades 4 and 5. SJE scored 48% while the state average was 53%. Although there is a 5% gap, we did improve in this area 15%. Contributing factors include, attention to the standards and expertise in reading instruction.

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

Two areas which showed the most improvement were ELA Learning Gains and ELA Learning Gains in the lowest 25%. Both areas made a 15% increase. Actions which contributed to this success were changing the ESE pull out model to push in, providing additional paraprofessional support for our lowest 25% in grades 4 and 5, and ongoing standards professional development.

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

Looking at Early Warning Systems, students failing ELA or Math classes are an area of potential concern. When planning for improvement, master schedule has been adjusted to provide support for these students in the departmentalized classroom setting. We are using paraproffesionals to support lowest 25% to maximize student learning.

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

1. Science
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA Learning Gains of lowest 25%
4. Attention to Subgroups of Black and Students with Disabilities
5. Math Learning Gains of lowest 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SJE had a negative gain for two years and continues to score below the state sore in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	SJE will increase 5th Grade FCAT Science achievement from 51% ot 60% or higher as measured on the 5th grade sience FCAT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SJE will continue to develop expertise in Science content, increase rigor and promote awareness of Science Standards school-wide. Using Marzano elements such as engagement and aligning standards, helps to target this area with a laser focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teahers must align standards and increase rigor throughout grade levels to improve performance in the area of Science. Unsing Marzano elements assures teachers are using techniques that increase success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We have grades 4/5 departmentalize, K-3 team, and TAG classes formed so teachers can specialize in a specific subject.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

2. A school-wide Science Plan has been developed and implemented.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

3. Targeted Professional Development and coaching will be utilized.

Person Responsible	Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

4. PLCs to increase awareness and good teaching strategies will be facilitated throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

5. Science consumables have been purchased to allow teachers to complete labs more regularly with students.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

6. Common assessments will be given and tracked on data walls displayed in hallways. The data will be analyzed at data days to make sure next steps are focused.

Person Responsible	Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

7. Supplemental materials were purchased such as Generation Genius and Everfi and FL Support Coach

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

8. Hands on Science lessons will be a focus for the POUNCE afterschool program and Intrersessions

Person Responsible	Rhonda Gosser (rhonda.gosser@yourcharlotteschools.net)

9. Follow the Pearson Elevate Science curriculum and CCPS guide.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Gosser (rhonda.gosser@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SJE has maintained a high percentage of achievement (3-5 FSA) and gains (4/ 5 FSA) including a slight increase in the gains for the lowest 25%. However, even with this increase data shows that the lowest 25% of students are still scoring significantly below the state level indicating a need for improvement. Support for these students is imperative for their continued success.
Measurable Outcome:	100 % of students will demonstrate one year's learning gain or growth in ELA with a laser-focus on the lowest 25% as measured by i-Ready and FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SJE will be using collaborative planning, aligned standards, small group differentiating, and other Marzano strategies to increase effectiveness of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All students will benefit from explicit direct best practices, but lower performing students will thrive in an environment that is differentiated and scaffolds for their needs. Small group allows for intense instruction and additional attention monitor progress.

Action Steps to Implement

*Departmentalization in grades 4-5, teaming in grades K-3, and TAG in grades 1-5 allows teachers to become experts in their content area and specialize instruction for their groups.
*Intervention materials have been purchased to improve learning outcome of lower students.
*Professional development in literacy instructional techniques and rigor of standards using Critical Concepts and Balanced Literacy Framework will improve overall learning.
*Additional ESE push in services and staffing support have been provided in classrooms where the lowest 25% have been clustered.
*School-wide systematic WIN plans were developed and implemented for all students using Fountas and Pinnell for lowest 25%.
*Data Days will be facilitated three times this school year to allow for teams to deeply analyze data, determine student needs, and collaborate to develop future lesson plans.
*Prescriptive coaching will be provided by the school's Lead Teacher including one-on-one or small group coaching sessions. Modeled lessons and instructional rounds will also provide coaching opportunities.
*Sadlier Vocabulary will be used for additional support in all grade levels.
*Top Score Writing will be used to help students improve their writing skills which in turn improve reading.
*Teacher Support Team (TST) meetings will compare progress of struggling student with the class and steps can be made for more intensive intervention

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SJE has maintained a high percentage of achievement (3-5 FSA) and gains (4/ 5 FSA) including a slight increase in the gains for the lowest 25%. However, even with this increase data shows that the lowest 25% of students are still scoring significantly below the state level indicating a need for improvement. Support for these students is imperative for their continued success.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of students will demonstrate 1 year's growth/learning gain in Math (with laser-focus on the lowest 25%) as measured by i-Ready or FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Marzano strategies such as collaboration (during PLCs and PDs) and alignment of standards (during Data Days and coaching sessions) will be used to maintain current high levels of achievement but will also bolster engagement and retention for lower performing students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher knowledge and effectiveness is a critical component here so providing coaching, collaboration, PD days, and time to analyze student progress will help focus their instruction. Focused instruction coupled with additional staff and supplemental support materials create an environment that allows intense, individualized learning.

Action Steps to Implement

*Departmentalization in grades 4-5, team teaching K-3, TAG 1-5
*Intervention materials have been purchased to be utilized with students in need of intervention
*Differentiated math fact fluency program, Reflex Math, with students in 2-5
*Professional development in RCM instructional techniques and Critical Concepts
*Data Days will be facilitated three times this school year to allow for teams to deeply analyze data, determine student needs, and collaborate to develop future lesson plans.
*Prescriptive coaching will be provided by the school's Lead Teacher including one-on-one or small group coaching sessions, in classroom coaching and modeling.
*Common math assessments are used K-5
*Grade level data walls will track results of common assessment data related to school-wide WIG
*Teacher Support Team (TST) meetings will compare progress of struggling student with the class and steps can be made for more intensive intervention.
*Monthly data support meetings to assist inputting information for tracking accountability in EDIS.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Close Achievement Gap for Subgroups identified in by ESSA. Black students and students with disabilities have been identified by the state as subgroups that are not achieving at the same rate as other subgroups. Both of these groups fell below the benchmark of 41% per 2018-19 school data.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of SJE students identified in the state subgroup categories will reduce the achievement gap in ELA, Math, and Science as measured by FSA, IReady, and FCAT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leader in Me program will provide support in making goals and providing a positive learning atmosphere for all students. Additional supports like push in services, intensive, targeted small groups, mtss meetings, and other resources will be available to support any lower performing student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development and coaching will provide necessary skills to teachers to target these subgroups. Use of a school-wide program that supports individual student needs, uses common language, and monitors progress will allow students to thrive. The above strategies will help to level the playing field so all students can achieve more as evidenced by Stephen Covey and Marzano.

Action Steps to Implement

*School based mentoring program and Leader in Me has been established for goal setting
*Staff members will provide students with or access to additional resources needed (guidance counseling, support from the social worker, etc.)
*ESE services model has been modified to provide push-in support by an ESE teacher or paraprofessional
*Targeted interventions are being utilized for identified subgroup students during the core reading block as well as in the WIN block utilizing materials such as Fountas and Pinnell.
*Professional development and coaching will be provided to teachers to gain instructional techniques (ex. Leading/Lagging Measures through Leader in Me coaching)
*Data Days will be facilitated three times per year to address changes needed per current data and conference with students to set new goals
*Child Talk meetings will be held monthly to continually monitor the overall and individual student growth of all subgroups
*MTSS System professional development and support will be ongoing, as well as frequent monitoring
*Student led conferences are held three times a year to share with families progress on goals.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Professional Development and extensive MTSS support will contribute to increased rates of proficiency overall in Math, Science and Reading skills. Additional resources and creative scheduling will provide additional support for lower performing students and students in our lowest reporting categories (Black and SWD).

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.

The Leader In Me program, which believes all students are leaders of their behavior and academics, and our PBIS plan establishes a positive school-wide culture. This year, our PBIS team has developed school wide positive expectations and students are rewarded. SJE plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by communicating needs and inviting them to be apart of the SJE family. SAC and PTO involvement will encourage a partnership as well as include families in school projects and decisions. Curriculum Nights, Academic Nights, Family Center Events, and fundraisers all contribute to this partnership bond.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00