

Duval County Public Schools

Seabreeze 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

<http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze>

Demographics

Principal: Aimee Kimball

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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 Duval 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	17

Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

<http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze>

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 KG-5	No	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

At Seabreeze Elementary, we aspire to build a foundation for lifelong learning by fostering individual growth. We provide unique opportunities for developing leadership skills, critical thinking, and creative expression. We want our Seahorses empowered, prepared and fulfilled.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seabreeze Elementary strives to provide a positive, engaging and thoughtful environment that will reach the whole child every day.

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
Kimball, Aimee	Principal	ALL
Romer, Rebekah	Teacher, ESE	Gifted Education
Reimer, Kathleen	Instructional Technology	5th Grade ELA
Troy, Ronrica	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline and Assessment Data
Crenshaw, Addison	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Begnoche, Kelly	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/10/2017, Aimee Kimball

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.*

2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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 .	

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	0	
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	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	
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

Thursday 6/25/2020

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	92	102	79	73	92	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	92	102	79	73	92	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	75%	50%	57%	63%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	56%	58%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	35%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	62%	63%	80%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	63%	62%	72%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	51%	55%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	48%	53%	73%	50%	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	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
	2018	65%	49%	16%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	72%	50%	22%	56%	16%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
	2018	76%	59%	17%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
	2018	78%	60%	18%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	77%	57%	20%	60%	17%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	49%	13%	53%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	56%	10%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	40	69	63	44	72	71	29				
ELL											
BLK	52	65	60	55	77	82	31				
HSP	81	83		81	83						
MUL	86	80		79	70						
WHT	79	71	52	83	78	64	71				
FRL	62	70	70	66	77	70	47				
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	41	38	31	50	57	42					
BLK	37	38	40	49	48	50	50				
HSP	61	60		78	60						
MUL	44			56							
WHT	79	56	31	83	66	42	79				
FRL	50	37	28	63	59	45	52				
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	35	39	27	58	56	53	33				
ASN	70			100							
BLK	36	40	23	52	64	53	31				
HSP	50			81							
MUL	60	50		75	60						
WHT	71	53	50	86	75	58	81				
FRL	41	41	28	63	62	45	64				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	576
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	83
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	60
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	82
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
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	66
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.

According to the Standard Walkthrough Dashboard, our lowest area of performance is Assessing Student Learning. Our overall rating was a 2.3, slightly behind Standards Focus Board at 2.9. When rolling out the Learning Arcs and Standards-Based Instruction model, our school focused on Steps 1-4, focusing on instructional delivery and understanding of standards based language. Our next step is to align our assessment practices with our instruction.

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

We did not utilize the SWT as an area of SIP focus in previous years. However, we believe that lower performance in Standards Focus Board reflects a disconnect in assessment practices. We focused on compliance first, as historically this was not an instructional culture that posted standards-based boards. We will shift from compliance to depth of understanding and increased ownership.

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.

Bottom Quartile Gains

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

Our strongest area, Instructional Delivery, ranked a 4.0 out 5. We believe quality instructional materials combined with purposeful selection of supplemental materials led to this strength. Our school increased 100 points in school grade, due to two years of decline and significant culture shift. Actions taken include utilizing all instructional support positions for strategic data-based student groups. We also utilized a teacher as a reading interventionist in 18/19, no longer a viable option.

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

We will continue to monitor students with extreme absences and support those families. Additionally, we will continue to support the academics for students scoring below proficiency.

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

1. Improved selection and creation of common assessments, leading to a noticeable improvement in Assessing Student Learning.
2. Increased ownership between teacher and students on the standards focus board.
3. Improve culture and climate data as evidenced by our 5Essentials staff survey.
4. Improve school safety and social/emotional well-being as evidenced by our 5 Essentials student survey.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through the use of Common Planning, Seabreeze Elementary will focus on improving their Assessing Student Learning practices as evidenced by the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool. We also hope to achieve significant improvement in the area of Standards Focus Board.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to improve our assessment dashboard from a rating of 2.3 to a 3.5 or greater. We believe another year of practice and implementation of a standards-based focus board will improve that dashboard from a 2.9 to 4.0 or greater.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers in grades K-5 will participate in a tightly aligned Common Planning weekly cycle (plan, teach, create, assess) using Learning Arc templates and coaching cycles with administration. After steps 1-4 (plan), teachers will receive immediate lesson feedback (teach). During the "create" portion of common planning, teachers will begin to craft quality assessments that align with standards. The final portion of the cycle, assess, will engage teachers in protocols that use completed assessments to determine mastery and quality of assessment. Simultaneously, teachers will engage in school based instructional rounds, where they will get to use the tool to gauge the effectiveness of instruction within their own teams. This will allow teachers to transparently see what we believe to be quality instruction and assessment, and to connect their observations to overall school improvement practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our 5Essentials data reports that teachers do not understand the ever-changing initiatives, and are confused by the disconnect between evaluation, feedback, and weekly walkthroughs. Bringing them into the full Learning Arc training helps complete the process, while including them on walkthroughs brings ownership and full understanding of the walkthrough tool. This collective responsibility improves teacher-administrator trust, as we are transparently working towards common goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet regularly to plan and prepare engaging lessons through the use of Learning Arc templates
2. Engage teachers in assessment practices that require full understanding of the standard and how it will be assessed.
3. Include all stakeholders (students, parents) in the standards-based instructional process by promoting academic language and student ownership.
4. Engage teachers in instructional review processes that allow them to be both provider and recipient of feedback via the standards walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will focus on maintenance of other school grade components by continuing previous interventions with fidelity. We will follow MTSS guidelines, use data to track the effectiveness of programs, and monitor classroom instruction and intervention. Our counselor, school teachers, and administrators will use the Problem Solving Team method to identify and support students with academic needs. For culture and climate, school leadership will focus on team building exercises, opportunities for empowerment, and building relationships. School-based committees and teams will support culture and climate endeavors with additional experiences and opportunities to become involved with the faculty. Finally, classroom teachers and school administration will support Social-Emotional Learning through Calm Classroom, Sanford Harmony, and CAREacter Education with daily instruction. Wellness Wednesdays will continue to be implemented.

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.

Monthly icebreakers
 Team building exercises
 Social-Emotional Instruction for staff and students
 Increased spirit nights
 Strategic selection of SAC appointments (Community Members)
 Enhanced business and faith-based partnerships
 Focus groups with students, teachers, families, and stakeholder groups

Continue with traditional events that serve as the open-door between school and home. These events include: Ice Cream Socials, Howls and Haystacks, Art of Family, Academic Night. The administration will make a concentrated effort for quality feedback that values and appreciates all staff members and stakeholders, working to connect community partnerships with opportunities that reward students and teachers.

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: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00