

Clay County Schools

S Bryan Jennings 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	0

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://sbj.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Mary Taylor

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://sbj.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	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School, staffed by highly-qualified teachers, will establish an open, caring, and safe environment which promotes maximum achievement, while challenging our scholars to meet today and tomorrow as happy, healthy, successful, and accountable individuals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School exists to prepare our scholars to be adult-life ready by forming lifelong learners for success in a competitive global market.

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
Chapman, Debbie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Chapman is a school administrator responsible for supporting the principal in the instructional leadership of our school, as well as to the overall well-being and safety of the scholars and staff.
Taylor, Mary	Principal	As the principal of S. Bryan Jennings Elementary, Mrs. Taylor is the instructional leader of the school. She leads the staff as they disaggregate all data sources to identify areas of strength and opportunity. She is responsible for the implementation of all state, district, and school initiatives.
Gleneski, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Gleneski is a Title I intervention teacher, as well as the Intervention Team Facilitator.
Ruckersfeldt, Jordan	Instructional Coach	Lead math interventions, assist with small group practices and data analysis for differentiation, and advance Eureka instruction. Additionally she serves as our school SAC Chair.
Henry, Casey	Teacher, K-12	Teacher third grade and Title I Lead.
Tutler, Sharyse	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach for ELA K-2. Provides interventions and supports for students and teachers.
Bowen, Sherry	School Counselor	School guidance counselor providing small and large group sessions, PBIS supports and interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Mary Taylor

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.*

1

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	63	69	61	66	59	60	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
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	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	4	12	10	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
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

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	65	73	65	65	64	63	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	11	10	11	10	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	65	73	65	65	64	63	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	11	10	11	10	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	58%	65%	57%	63%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	62%	58%	67%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	66%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	70%	63%	58%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	66%	62%	60%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	56%	51%	53%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	65%	53%	62%	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	67%	68%	-1%	58%	9%
	2018	57%	68%	-11%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	64%	-7%	58%	-1%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	51%	62%	-11%	56%	-5%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	55%	64%	-9%	54%	1%
	2018	60%	63%	-3%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	71%	-8%	62%	1%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%
	2018	57%	66%	-9%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
	2018	61%	65%	-4%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
06	2019	53%	70%	-17%	55%	-2%
	2018	65%	68%	-3%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	63%	-1%	53%	9%
	2018	56%	64%	-8%	55%	1%
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	39	48	43	50	47	29	41				
ELL	30	47		45	50		30				
BLK	41	45	45	56	49	27	41				
HSP	62	53		54	59	67	70				
MUL	50	42		64	58						
WHT	67	59	47	71	62	30	68				
FRL	52	51	56	60	52	35	62				
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	43	43	22	48	50	21	33				
ELL					64						
BLK	46	60	69	59	61	44	42				

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	56	55		62	61						
MUL	65	56		78	79						
WHT	67	49	24	70	71	48	58				
FRL	57	59	36	65	65	47	49				
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	57	68	63	52	54	53	46				
BLK	48	67	69	48	61	57					
HSP	64	71		51	69						
MUL	60	60		60	55						
WHT	71	65	67	65	56	50	66				
FRL	61	71	70	55	56	48	66				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	46
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	43
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	61
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	54
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	58
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The component performing the lowest on the 2019 FSA was the Lower Quartile students in Mathematics, with a 37%. This data is substantiated by last year's i-Ready data indicating intensive interventions and small group differentiated instruction is needed to increase performance levels of lower quartile students. I-Ready data supported this in 2019 when 21% of our student population showed they were at risk for tier 3 support services based on baseline assessments and again this year (2020) as 25% of scholars show they are at risk for tier 3.

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

Not surprisingly based upon the above, the component which showed the greatest decline from the 2018 FSA was Math learning gains which dropped from 69% in 2018 to 57% in 2019. This decline may be due to the implementation of a new math curriculum (Eureka) in the 2018-2019 school year. Teachers were intentional with instruction and strict with fidelity the program implementation, however small group time and differentiation needs were not addressed as frequently as needed.

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 component which showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the lowest quartile in math. Contributing factors are likely the implementation of the new curriculum (Eureka), lack of basic math facts necessary for grade level proficiency, lack of number sense, and not enough time denoted to small groups and differentiation.

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

The component which showed the most improvement on the 2019 FSA was the lowest quartile in English Language Arts, which saw an increase from 36% in 2018 to 49% in 2019; this reflects an increase of 13%. Contributing actions include a change in curriculum (LAFS), increased small group differentiated instruction, and tracking student data in data notebooks and through student led conferencing. Additionally based on i-Ready data we had 27% grow to 47% proficient in ELA by D2 and 76% were able to meet their annual typical growth goals.

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

An area of concern from the EWS data is the number of students scoring a level 1 on the 2019 FSA in ELA and/or Math.

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

1. Improving lower quartile proficiency in math by increasing math proficiency overall on the 2021 FSA.
2. Improving ELA proficiency for all on the FSA by implementing small group instruction.
3. Supporting PBIS through the 7 Mindsets curriculum to increase student engagement.

- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Students must be able to comprehend and apply mathematical concepts, operations, and relations accurately and efficiently in order to become skilled problem solvers.

Measurable Outcome: SBJ's Lower Quartile students scored 37% in mathematics on the 2018-2019 FSA and will increase at least 15% on the 2020-2021 Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: If all teachers implement small group instruction that is differentiated and data driven with research based interventions (i-Ready toolbox), then we will increase student learning gains in mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows differentiated instruction helps close learning gaps and increase proficiency. I-Ready data shows that 26% of our school is two or more grade levels behind, with the domains of Numbers and Operations in Base Ten (18% proficiency) and Algebra and Algebraic Thinking (22% proficiency) being the areas of greatest need. Utilizing i-Ready data, instructional grouping profile, and Tools for Instruction gives teacher the resources to help close the achievement gaps. Additionally, the math coach will assist in monitoring student data and provide additional interventions and supports for lower quartile scholars.

Action Steps to Implement

Eureka training for all math teachers.

Professional development for small group instruction.

Data analysis to form small groups.

On-going data analysis of data to ensure fluid small groups.

Support of small group interventions and instruction by Math Coach.

Coaching Cycles and model lessons with Math Coach to ensure highly effective, differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Students must be proficient in English Language Arts to succeed in all aspects of grade level curriculum.

Measurable Outcome: SBJ scored 58% proficient in ELA on the 2018-2019 FSA and will increase by 7% to at least 65% on the 2020-2021 assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students in grade 3-6 will utilize the Read, Discuss, Read strategy along with Achieve 3000 articles in conjunction with LAFS curriculum. Students in grades K-2 will utilize the LAFS curriculum along with i-Ready computer based instruction, SIPPS, and LLI to increase skills necessary for the reading of complex texts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing the strategies defined will result in increased reading proficiency. Basic reading skills will be strengthened allowing for the inclusion and understanding of complex texts in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development in Read, Discuss, Read strategy, Achieve 3000, i-Ready, and LAFS.
 Monitoring of instruction through classroom walkthroughs, on-going data reviews, and conferencing.
 Inclusion of complex text in all content areas (science and social studies).
 Coaching cycles and model lessons with instructional coaches and administration.
 Support of small group instruction and interventions by instructional ELA coaches and ITF.
 Monitoring student data and fluidity of small group, differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Common expectations for positive behavior throughout the school will decrease disruptive behaviors and discipline referrals, as well as increase student learning. This was identified as a critical need from discipline data from the 2019-2020 school year. The data indicates that our discipline has increased, with the majority of those 143 referrals stemming from classroom incidents. Another large portion of referrals stemmed from incidents in common areas, such as the cafeteria, the playground, and the restrooms. By improving our culture, explicitly teaching social emotional skills, having a set of common school-wide expectations, and how to regulate emotions engagement will improve and behavior will decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

In an effort to emphasize positive behaviors, we have implemented a Pawsitive Office Referral Initiative whereby students are recognized for exemplary behavior. We expect to recognize at least 25% of our students, which will be logged in a Google Sheet throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

If the 7 Mindsets curriculum is embedded into classrooms to support PBIS, then positive student behavior, student engagement and student ownership will increase. In turn, this will improve the overall school environment and culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If all teachers establish a classroom community to support the Positive Behavior System (PBIS), then student engagement and ownership in their educational goals will increase. SBJ has a PBIS vertical team which supports staff with positive behavior goals. Professional development will be given in (SEL) social emotional learning along with de-escalation techniques. All faculty will support PBIS by giving PAWSitive reward tickets, by acknowledging exemplary behavior with a Pawsitive Office Referral, and by highlighting students with exemplary representation of the monthly mindset in our Out of This World Student of the Month.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development on SEL and de-escalation techniques.

Align Character traits and 7 Mindsets.

Align Book of the month with the character traits & 7 Mindsets to create a monthly calendar for teacher use.

Continue 7 Mindsets use campus-wide K-6.

Campus wide Morning meetings K-6.

Create a staff PBIS 'Playbook' with teacher expectations.

ISS assistant to push into classrooms and work with scholars on emotional regulation and engagement strategies.

PBIS Team to meet monthly and monitor school-wide implementation and provide PD and resources for staff.

Person Responsible

Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Each of the priorities mentioned in the needs assessment have been deemed an area of focus for S. Bryan Jennings Elementary. The administrative team will continue to monitor and support mathematical instruction, data analysis, use of the Title I math teacher, and resources to improve proficiency levels for not only the lower quartile but all students within the school. Additionally, the administrative team will utilize the two Title I teachers and support staff, resources, and data analysis to increase reading proficiency school wide. For both math and ELA, small group instruction and interventions will be systematic and an integral part in leading the increased proficiency. Frequent data dives and walkthroughs will provide feedback and collaboration. Administration will ensure engagement is peaked by establishing and solidifying PBIS as a school expectation and culture by embedding SEL into our daily instruction, utilizing the 7 Mindsets curriculum. A team of school staff will form the PBIS committee joined by administration to also provide resources and professional development regarding student engagement, SEL strategies, and the 7 Mindsets curriculum.

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.

SBJ is creating a Parent Volunteer Organization to help train parents to give positive support to their child's education. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, we are utilizing a virtual format to begin the first semester. We will host our annual Parent Night, Literacy Night, Math Night, Orientation/Open House, along with monthly grade level curriculum discussions, and other opportunities for stakeholders to support the needs of SBJ. The SBJ School Improvement Plan, along with the Parent and Family Engagement Plan, is developed and reviewed yearly with parent, teacher, and community input and is made available to LEA, parents, and the public in an easy to read printed format at the front desk of SBJ and on the SBJ website.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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