

Clay County Schools

Charles E. Bennett 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Charles E. Bennett Elementary School

1 S OAKRIDGE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://ceb.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Amanda Strickland

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2019

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
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: D (37%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Charles E. Bennett Elementary School

1 S OAKRIDGE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://ceb.oneclay.net>

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-6	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

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.

At Charles E. Bennett Elementary, our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Charles E. Bennett Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cagle, Sheree	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and vision for the school. Responsible for maintaining a school that has a safe environment as well as quality instruction. Administers balanced budget, promotes a positive work environment, and involves community stakeholders and parents.
Mainer, Dimitra	Assistant Principal	Responsible for maintaining school wide discipline, interviewing and hiring of teachers and staff, and transportation coordinator. Promoted an environment that fosters learning and a collegial atmosphere for teachers and staff
Hiers, Christina	Instructional Coach	Collects, analyzes and interprets school level data to determine next steps for instruction. Provides support to individual classroom teachers in curriculum implementation, understanding academic content, use of instructional materials and strategies, use of data to improve instruction through the implementation of coaching cycles. Title 1 lead teacher.
Smith, Laura	Assistant Principal	Responsible for maintaining school wide discipline, monitors attendance, textbook manager and testing coordinator.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/15/2019, Amanda Strickland

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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: D (37%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	83	82	84	91	82	95	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	9	13	7	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	7	4	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	22	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	0	33	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
	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	2	0	3	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	5	8	15	12	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 5/28/2020

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	85	76	87	93	87	96	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	632
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	45	76	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	249

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	2	8	10	25	18	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	85	76	87	93	87	96	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	632
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	45	76	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	249

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	2	8	10	25	18	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	34%	65%	57%	37%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	62%	58%	48%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	54%	53%	48%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	39%	70%	63%	48%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	32%	66%	62%	56%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	56%	51%	37%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	65%	53%	34%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	34%	68%	-34%	58%	-24%
	2018	40%	68%	-28%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	29%	64%	-35%	58%	-29%
	2018	34%	62%	-28%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	38%	64%	-26%	54%	-16%
	2018	33%	63%	-30%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	71%	-18%	62%	-9%
	2018	44%	70%	-26%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	69%	-23%	64%	-18%
	2018	45%	66%	-21%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	32%	64%	-32%	60%	-28%
	2018	41%	65%	-24%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
06	2019	28%	70%	-42%	55%	-27%
	2018	30%	68%	-38%	52%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	63%	-32%	53%	-22%
	2018	29%	64%	-35%	55%	-26%
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	18	48	64	18	26	34	19				
ELL	29	57		41	50						
BLK	22	46	50	22	29	40					
HSP	39	62		50	45		29				
MUL	15			42	60						
WHT	37	46	52	41	29	21	40				
FRL	30	46	50	35	30	27	23				

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	13	40	47	19	33	27	12				
ELL	20	45		27	33						
BLK	20	45	52	23	37	31					

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
HSP	32	48		51	50						
MUL	18			33							
WHT	40	52	40	44	42	32	30				
FRL	31	46	43	37	37	24	21				
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	17	37	43	25	45	35	20				
ELL	22	31		33	46						
BLK	15	42	54	24	44	35	10				
HSP	41	52		57	65						
MUL	45			55							
WHT	42	48	38	54	58	38	41				
FRL	30	45	47	41	48	35	24				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 lowest performance area overall was ELA Proficiency at 34%, although the lowest subdomain was Math LPQ at 28%. The fifth and sixth grade seem to contribute the most in this observation. The new curriculum along with the lack of small group instruction effective this outcome.

The trend of LPQ showing the lowest movement, if any, is consistent with district patterns over previous years.

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

Math Learning gains for all students declined from 41% to 31%. This attributed to a new curriculum and the presence of several new teachers in those tested grades.

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.

Consistent with the above observations, Math Gains showed the wide gap between CEB students and the state results. The 34 point difference is the greatest gap, although overall math and ELA, as well as LPQ math and science were all at least 20 points different.

There were several brand new teachers in the tested grades in the 2018-2019 school year that can explain some of the gap. But there was also a new math curriculum, and the beginning of small group instructional strategies that had not been used recently. Data is not an issue as the District utilizes multiple electronic platforms, and makes available to teachers the information to help inform instruction.

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

The ELA LPQ profile showed the greatest gain (7 points) and put the overall results within four points of the state average. This gain can be attributed to a focused push for rigour text in hands of students, and raising expectations around literacy across the campus. The reading coach focused her attention on supporting the intermediate grades, allowing for more personalized supports.

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

Average daily attendance continues to be a concern. During the 2019-20 school year we had a slight improvement but this continues to be an area of focus. The school has an Assistant Principal and a

full time Social Worker that work together to help focus on these families with the consistent attendance issues.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Math & Reading Gains
4. Science Proficiency
5. Culture for Students and Staff

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we provide quality instruction by aligning lessons to the Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity then student achievement will improve. We will have ongoing PLC's focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning. We will develop an ongoing feedback loop between leadership and teachers, teachers and academic coaches, students and teachers and students and students.

Measurable Outcome: Academic Coaches supporting academic planning/PLC for unpacking standards, lesson planning and vertical awareness, teachers will attend 90% of the sessions as documented by sign in sheets.
Instructional modeling with side by side coaching, targeted feedback and instructional focus, coaches will model at least 10 lessons per semester with documentation.
Targeted instructional interventions for all students who need them, data and list of students will be available.
Students will complete a Florida Standards based checklist with 70% accuracy in Reading, Math and 5th grade Science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Academic Coaches will have focused support in the areas of reading, math and science. Coaches will work one-on-one with teachers, complete coaching cycles and collaboratively plan with teachers to provide effective standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: High quality professional development to teachers is among the most important and long standing challenges facing schools. Investing in on the job training offering side by side teaching and planning with high quality instructional coaches will develop high performing teachers. This will help teachers with the daily challenges. (Kraft 2017)
https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/mkraft/files/kraft_blazar_hogan_2016_teacher_coaching_meta-analysis_wp_w_appendix.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

Reading Coaches will help teachers plan and monitor implementation of a research based reading and a writing programs both programs that are focused on Florida Standards. Coaches will plan and coach side by side with teachers to ensure proper implementation. They will ensure the proper reading interventions and blended learning platforms are utilized effectively and monitored.

Person Responsible Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

Math Coaches will help teachers plan and will monitor implementation of a research based math program based on Florida Standards blended with the current math curriculum. Coaches will plan and coach side by side with teachers to ensure proper implementation. They will monitor the use and implementation of blended learning platforms.

Person Responsible Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

Science Coach will help fully develop a science lab and implement a Science Academy on Saturday. The academy will focus on students who are nearing proficiency and will cover all fair game standards. The science coach will monitor the use and implementation of science blended learning platforms.

Person Responsible Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

If we cultivate positive, appropriate relationships resulting in increased engagement of all students and stakeholders, then we will develop a student centered culture, building a culture of respect. We will share collective responsibility for the success of all students to be successful and safe. We will demonstrate a growth mindset with high expectations for all learners, provide opportunities for students to collaborate and develop personal and social responsibility.

Measurable Outcome:

Parent Engagement Activities focused around academics and data will take place at least 10 times during the year.
 School Social Worker will make home visits and document these visits as needed for attendance and social issues.
 Parent Liaison to support parent activities during the school day, will show an increase of school volunteers by 50%.
 Increase positive parent communication by use of student agenda planners with parents signing daily at least 70% of the time. Student will take home Weekly Communication folder.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Parent Liaison, Social Social Worker and Title 1 Lead will work together to involve parent in all aspects of the students learning, giving them many opportunities to be involved within the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Parent engagement happens when teachers involve parents in school meetings or events, and parents volunteer their support at home and at school. In this way, they make a commitment. Parents commit to prioritizing their child’s educational goals, and teachers commit to listening and providing a space for collaboration with parents. waterford.org

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a Parent Involvement room with the parent liaison within the school, so that parent will have resources available to work with their child and also have computer access.

Person Responsible

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Social Workers to make regular home visits to encourage attendance and positive interactions with the school.

Person Responsible

Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Family Engagement Activities to involve parents with the academics and data driven discussions about students.

Person Responsible

Christina Hiers (christina.hiers@myoneclay.net)

Professional Development for staff to find better ways to relate to students and parents. Professional Development for leadership for more innovative methods to involve the stakeholders.

Person Responsible

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The inclusion of a second school administrator allows for school operations and teacher/ staff supports to be distributed to a smaller ratio, allowing for more intentional supports that ultimately improves school culture, teacher efficacy, and higher student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome: Increase in all state accountability cells.
Improved community connections and parent participation.
Increase the number of students proficient in each ESSA sub group by at least 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Community engagement with family liaison, business partners and faith based partners. Monitors attendances and works with social worker on areas of concern.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Assistant principal relieves the principal to focus on teacher support, establishes closer community connections and can respond to the needs of families and constituents in a more timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

Social Worker working with the Assistant Principal to coordinate home visits for students with excessive absences.

Person Responsible Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Expand Community Mentoring program to include faith based partners and community organizations.

Person Responsible Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Identifying students who are the Lowest Performing Quartile that are on virtual learning with OneClay.net that will still be attached to the school. Making sure that students receive interventions

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 positive school culture is built by believing and living our mission and vision statement. Charles E Bennett shares a single vision for the benefit for the students and families of the Green Cove Springs community. We have embraced the Social-Emotional Learning for teachers and students through the 7 Mindsets. We are building a culture of resilience with our teachers and students to never give up and always keep going. We communicate with parents and community often using social media, parent newsletters, parent link, class dojo, weekly folders and student agenda. We recognize our students and staff for the amazing things they do every day both academically and behaviorally. We are working in improving our image in the community showing them what a wonderful school Charles E Bennett is again!

Charles E Bennett will have 5 SAC meetings per year with an organizational meeting in September. The meetings will be held both in person and virtually during the 2020-2021 school year. This is in hope to include many stakeholders that can not attend in person due to work responsibilities.

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: Instructional Coaching				\$123,170.97
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$44,290.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Math coach to support grade 3-6 teachers with professional learning, modeling, side-by-side teaching, data informed decision making and establishing the best environment to increase student achievement</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,429.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement for math coach 10%</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,388.19
			<i>Notes: Social Security for math coach 7.65%</i>			

	6400	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,250.00
			<i>Notes: Group Insurance for math coach</i>			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$633.35
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for Math coach 1.43%</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$47,380.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for science coach to support grades 3-6 with professional learning, modeling, side-by-side teaching, hands on science guidance, science lab support and management, and building teachers understanding of science standards and the importance of reading strategies for academic achievement in science.</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,738.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement for Science Coach 10%</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,624.57
			<i>Notes: Social Security for Science Coach 7.65%</i>			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,250.00
			<i>Notes: Group Insurance for Science Coach</i>			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$633.35
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for Science Coach 1.43%</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,554.51
			<i>Notes: Supplies - consumable science lab supplies including tuning forks, batteries, flash lights, mirrors, rubber balls, magnets, prisms, styrofoam balls, light bulbs,rocks/minerals</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$58,026.10
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$44,319.87
			<i>Notes: Salary for Social Worker to support students and parents in reducing barriers that cause tardiness, absenteeism, behavior problems, discipline problems and stressors that reduce academic achievement. Additionally social workers connect students and families with supports in the community.</i>			
	6110	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,431.99
			<i>Notes: Retirement for social worker</i>			
	6110	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,390.47
			<i>Notes: Social Security for social worker</i>			
	6110	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,250.00
			<i>Notes: Group Insurance for social worker</i>			

	6110	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$633.77
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for social worker</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development				\$86,942.64
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7300	110-Administrators	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$68,603.15
			<i>Notes: Assistant Principal works with social worker to create optimum conditions and supports for struggling students to be successful, builds community relationships to provide mentors and increase community involvement. Provides supports to teachers with 7 Mindsets, SEL, and trauma informed work. Collaborates with principal, guidance and the district on early warning data.</i>			
	7300	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$6,860.32
			<i>Notes: Retirement Assistant principal 10%</i>			
	7300	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,248.14
			<i>Notes: Social Security Assistant Principal 7.65%</i>			
	7300	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,250.00
			<i>Notes: Group Insurance Assistant Principal</i>			
	7300	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$981.03
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation Assistant Principal 1.43%</i>			
					Total:	\$277,900.00