

Clay County Schools

Wilkinson Junior High 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Wilkinson Junior High School

5025 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://wjh.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Nate Warmouth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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)	59%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Wilkinson Junior High School

5025 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://wjh.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)
Middle School 7-8	No	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

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.

Our mission is to instill in our scholars a desire for lifelong learning while providing positive experiences. Our scholars will be equipped with the knowledge, skills, resilience, and personal responsibility needed to face any challenge and be successful contributors to our global society. We believe it takes students, parents, faculty, staff, and our community partners working together to make this happen. By working together our scholars will soar to their highest levels of personal and academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe all children can learn.

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
Cornwell, Christina	Principal	
Mimbs, Mary	Assistant Principal	
Ammons, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Robin	Teacher, K-12	
Fowler, Jeffrey	Teacher, K-12	
Doughty, Steven	Instructional Coach	
Byers, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Nate Warmouth

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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)	59%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	367	356	0	0	0	0	723	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	54	0	0	0	0	110	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	56	0	0	0	0	115	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	88	0	0	0	0	206	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	60	0	0	0	0	130	

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	33	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	356	0	0	0	0	743	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	54	0	0	0	0	110	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	56	0	0	0	0	115	
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	0	0	0	70	60	0	0	0	0	130	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	356	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	54	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	56	0	0	0	0	115
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	0	0	0	70	60	0	0	0	0	130

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
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	48%	61%	54%	52%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	58%	54%	54%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	47%	42%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	63%	69%	58%	70%	69%	56%
Math Learning Gains	65%	63%	57%	68%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	56%	51%	60%	53%	50%
Science Achievement	50%	66%	51%	56%	60%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	81%	72%	78%	81%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
	(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
07	2019	48%	59%	-11%	52%	-4%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	48%	62%	-14%	56%	-8%
	2018	64%	67%	-3%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	46%	63%	-17%	54%	-8%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	54%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	61%	49%	12%	46%	15%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	45%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	50%	64%	-14%	48%	2%
	2018	61%	67%	-6%	50%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	80%	-6%	71%	3%
2018	71%	78%	-7%	71%	0%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	65%	27%	61%	31%
2018	96%	66%	30%	62%	34%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	43	39	35	55	49	21	51	46		
BLK	45	57	50	52	76	71	34	76	67		
HSP	54	54	53	47	50	53	50	75	74		
MUL	38	53		56	53						
WHT	47	48	46	65	65	54	51	73	64		
FRL	44	47	43	59	63	50	44	68	67		
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	19	37	37	32	43	34	26	42	45		

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
BLK	42	48	40	43	47	33	48	67	25		
HSP	55	54		63	63	40	77	76	80		
MUL	56	56		71	53		50				
WHT	55	54	48	62	53	44	61	70	64		
FRL	50	53	43	55	50	42	55	68	58		
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	20	39	35	39	52	46	26	40	29		
BLK	45	39		61	74	69	41	81			
HSP	63	56		76	77	64	66	100	32		
MUL	60	67		72	75		77	83	60		
WHT	51	54	41	70	67	59	55	77	43		
FRL	44	50	41	63	66	58	47	74	33		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

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	59
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	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	54
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.

ELA and Science

Reading Achievement is a factor that results in testing deficiencies not only in Reading but also Science and Civics. We have over 1/3 of our student population qualifying for Intensive Reading Education. Of the 6 teachers in the ELA department 5 were new hires. Reading has to be addressed every year until all of our students reach a college and career ready reading ability.

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

Science

Reading comprehension was a factor along with retaining teachers and mid-year instructional changes. Two of the four 8th grade Science classrooms went through multiple teacher changes.

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.

ELA

We have over 1/3 of our student population qualifying for Intensive Reading Education. Of the 6 teachers in the ELA department 5 were new hires. Reading has to be addressed every year until all of our students reach a college and career ready reading ability.

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

Out of School Suspension Reduced due to creating more restorative justice opportunities and implementing our own alternative learning environment for students who were not showing success in the traditional classroom.

Advanced Math Success increased by giving more students the opportunity to participate in higher math classes. Support was given to struggling students instead of removing them from the class.

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

Attendance. We have to convince parents that students need to be in school every day every hour of the day. Students also need to want to come to our school. I believe that by creating a positive environment and continually reinforce to parents and students how difficult it is for students to maintain or gain knowledge when they are absent frequently.

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

1. Engagement
2. Rigor
3. Ownership of student learning
4. Grade Level Appropriate Instruction (Curriculum and Instructional Strategies)
5. SLE Curriculum implementation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: TREK (Think-Research-Experience-Know): Identify high-risk or potentially high-risk students, that exhibit a pattern of behavior that will lead them to an alternative school, and implement interventions to alter said behaviors. Student-centered teams for 8th grade that emphasize high interest learning through hands-on instruction and development of intrinsic motivation by promoting inquiry and embedding social skills within the structured classroom community with a strategic grouping of peers.

Measurable Outcome: Students will make learning gains in both Math and Reading FSA. They will make gains in their Reading Lexile based on Achieve 3000 monthly assessments. Students will attend school 85% of the expected days or more (depending on Covid) and reduce their disciplinary referrals by 50% from the previous school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Byers (jennifer.byers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Project-Based Learning is a teaching method in which students gain knowledge and skills by working for an extended period of time to investigate and respond to an authentic, engaging, and complex question, problem, or challenge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research by Mida Learning Technologies showed that after utilizing PBL through Defined Learning in science classes for one year (2015-2016), teachers saw improvements in students' engagement and motivation. In addition, students who used Defined Learning outperformed their peers in critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development-July 13

Person Responsible Steven Doughty (steven.doughty@myoneclay.net)

Create Classroom Norms-first as a team of teachers, then with students. August 2020

Person Responsible Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

Student goal setting for Q1.

Person Responsible Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

Q1 goal check

Person Responsible Jennifer Byers (jennifer.byers@myoneclay.net)

Semester 1 goal check and conferencing.

Person Responsible Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

Semester 2 goal setting

Person Responsible Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

Q3 goal check and conferencing

Person Responsible Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

Semester 2 goal setting

Person Responsible Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

Q3 goal check and conferencing

Person Responsible Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

End of year goal setting and conferencing-articulation to High School.

Person Responsible Jennifer Byers (jennifer.byers@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase academic achievement for the 2020-2021 school year WJHS will focus on increasing writing across the curriculum. Basic writing standards will be created across core content curriculum. In creating these standards students will have a structured base on how to write in each class they enter. Writing frequently across the curriculum has been shown to significantly help raise achievement. Writing encompasses many other skills that can help lead to better reading, critical thinking, and comprehension skills.

Measurable Outcome: Students' achievement will rise from 48% to 58%. Student Learning gains will rise from 49% to 59%. Lower Quartile gains will rise from 47% to 57%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Campbell (robin.campbell@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas, concepts, and information through the selection, organization, and analysis of relevant content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using 2018-19 FSA data coupled with Performance Matters data from the 19-20 school year this standard and accompanying strategies seemed to be one of the main reasons students were struggling on these summative assessments. The goal is to focus on this strategy to help increase student proficiency, critical thinking, and comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus	ALPS- Accelerated Learning Pathways
Description and Rationale:	A framework of learning for junior high school students with an emphasis on the development of collegiate skills and career readiness through Project-Based Learning. Prepares students for high school accelerated programs in every Clay County school.
Measurable Outcome:	The enrolled students will show proficiency on their End of Course exams and complete all coursework required to earn high school credit,
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Doughty (steven.doughty@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Project-Based Learning is a teaching method in which students gain knowledge and skills by working for an extended period of time to investigate and respond to an authentic, engaging, and complex question, problem, or challenge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research by Mida Learning Technologies showed that after utilizing PBL through Defined Learning in science classes for one year (2015-2016), teachers saw improvements in students' engagement and motivation. In addition, students who used Defined Learning outperformed their peers in critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

Action Steps to Implement

July 13-Project-Based Learning Teacher Inservice

Person Responsible Steven Doughty (steven.doughty@myoneclay.net)

August 2020-ALP's project planning

Person Responsible Steven Doughty (steven.doughty@myoneclay.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social Emotional Learning. Guided through our PBIS Team, a curriculum (Seven Mindsets) will be utilized in addition to a definitive discipline process to promote our Goal of building students that exhibit Respect, Responsibility, Resilience, and Restraint. Concerns had been expressed in our annual climate survey that students and teachers felt that there was concern over the use of social/emotional skills that promote success in and out of the classroom.

Measurable Outcome: Increased student ownership of academics and social emotional skills. Specific skills denoted in our panorama data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christina Cornwell (christina.cornwell@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing the Seven Mindsets program and lessons to work toward increased student ownership and social emotional skills. Restorative Justice Program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Initiating the Mindsets training will help students' social and emotional competencies which will in turn lead to lowered discipline issues, less suspensions, and an increase in goal setting which should impact student academic performance as well.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Team 7: This is time set aside during the school week to teach the Mindset lesson. Teachers present the lessons and have time to discuss with students about the Mindset focus that is being covered.

Person Responsible Christina Cornwell (christina.cornwell@myoneclay.net)

2. PBIS: Set school wide expectations and increase positive behavior.

Person Responsible Christina Cornwell (christina.cornwell@myoneclay.net)

3. School Wide Assemblies: These assemblies are focused on helping students to make positive choices toward their lives. These include alcohol literacy, bully and harassment, and how to create a culture of inclusion and connectedness (especially during this time of COVID precautions).

Person Responsible Christina Cornwell (christina.cornwell@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

None

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.

Foster two way home/school communication with all stakeholders to support student learning. Communication strategies include Remind.com, Facebook, Google Classroom, School Web-Page, Mass Parent Portal Phone Calls, Smores, Mass emails, Parent/Teacher Conferences, Individual parent phone calls and notes home all increase the degree of connection with all stakeholders.

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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00