

Clay County Schools

Doctors Inlet 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Carolyn Ayers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	19

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">35%</p>

School Grades History

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

Doctors Inlet Elementary School's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, rigorous, engaging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing learning opportunities that are relevant to the real world and transcend 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.

Doctors Inlet Elementary school exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring 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
Ayers, Carolyn	Principal	This team meets monthly to discuss the ongoings of Doctors Inlet Elementary. They represent each of the teams at DIS. They provide input, help to vote, and disseminate information to teachers.
Mineo, Kristi	Assistant Principal	
Long, Hannah	Teacher, K-12	
Wellons, Techla	Teacher, K-12	
Lang, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Hansen, Missy	Teacher, K-12	
Bohn, Laura	Teacher, ESE	
Adkison, Karey	Teacher, K-12	
Torres, Suzette	Teacher, K-12	
Farber, Jocelyn	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Carolyn Ayers

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.*

5

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.*

9

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	67	59	66	73	89	84	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	9	1	15	16	15	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	6	0	0	22	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	5	0	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	2	5	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

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	79	77	77	95	86	91	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	10	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	1	39	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	79	77	77	95	86	91	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	10	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	1	39	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	63%	65%	57%	65%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	62%	58%	61%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	53%	61%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	70%	63%	64%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	66%	62%	55%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	51%	49%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	65%	53%	69%	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	61%	68%	-7%	58%	3%
	2018	66%	68%	-2%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
	2018	54%	62%	-8%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	57%	62%	-5%	56%	1%
	2018	68%	59%	9%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	76%	64%	12%	54%	22%
	2018	74%	63%	11%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	71%	2%	62%	11%
	2018	72%	70%	2%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
	2018	55%	66%	-11%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	70%	64%	6%	60%	10%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
06	2019	74%	70%	4%	55%	19%
	2018	83%	68%	15%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	63%	-8%	53%	2%
	2018	63%	64%	-1%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	57	63	65	76	47	41				
ELL	53	42		63	77						
ASN	90			100							
BLK	47	56	54	51	59	38	31				
HSP	57	70		67	50						
MUL	50	36		61	64						
WHT	67	63	57	76	73	64	63				
FRL	50	52	55	70	73	61	40				

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	45	51	38	53	59	46	43				
ELL	54			38							

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ASN	100			90							
BLK	55	66	50	61	53	58	45				
HSP	49	64	60	63	72		67				
MUL	50	40		55	47						
WHT	72	63	40	74	67	57	70				
FRL	63	61	45	69	64	59	60				
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	33	46	56	41	39	33	47				
ELL	42			58							
BLK	44	50	50	50	44	33	50				
HSP	64	57		54	43	30					
MUL	39	40		54	55						
WHT	72	67	72	69	60	64	76				
FRL	58	61	60	58	49	40	60				

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	62
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59

English Language Learners	
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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	53
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	66
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	57
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 science scores from 2018-2019 were the lowest proficiency area at 55%. This was a 12 point drop from the previous year. Contributing factors included a new curriculum and a high ESE population who struggled reading and comprehending grade level science content. During the 2019-2020 school year, we focused on science by improving our science lab on campus, encouraging training in the new science curriculum, increasing science vocabulary, and increasing the integration of science across content areas. We also worked to improve student engagement in science through after school clubs and we provided resources for teachers to engage families in science content both for our English and non-English speaking families.

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

Science was the greatest decline from the previous year with a 12 point decrease. Contributing factors included a new curriculum and a high ESE population who struggled to read and comprehend grade level science content. Other factors included lack of science vocabulary and student engagement.

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.

Using the 2018-2019 data, Doctors Inlet Elementary achieved higher than the state average in each component.

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

Lowest quartile learning gains showed the most improvement, increasing from 44% to 58%. The actions leading to this improvement included targeted small group instruction, LLI, SIPPS, Achieve 3000, and iReady LAFS.

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

Based on EWS data, an area of potential concern is student attendance. Having students present and engaged in the classroom can drastically decrease course failures and suspensions.

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

1. Increase reading proficiency (which will also support science proficiency)
2. Increase SEL for all students to decrease negative behaviors and increase attendance
3. Increase student engagement in the classroom and online
4. Increase lowest 25th percentile math learning gains⁵.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 2018-2019 data showed a 4% decrease in school ELA achievement. Along with this, there was a 2% decrease in ELA learning gains. Working to increase ELA proficiency is critical. This will also support increasing science proficiency as students need support in comprehending grade level text and vocabulary.

Measurable Outcome: School ELA achievement will increase from 63% to 67%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies to be implemented include LAFS interventions, LLI, SIPPS, and targeted small group instruction. In addition, science based nonfiction text and vocabulary will be integrated through Achieve 3000 to support student ability to read and comprehend grade level science content and vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies and interventions help increase reading proficiency. When reading proficiency and vocabulary is improved, students will also have increased science proficiency based on their abilities to read and comprehend grade level text.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training for improving ELA and reading instruction. Targeted Professional Development for teachers to enhance the reading instruction over multiple subject areas. Including inviting district coaches in to work with teachers to guide them in planning and developing small groups for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Kristi Mineo (kristi.mineo@myoneclay.net)

Provide time to analyze student data and plan accordingly.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social Emotional Learning can have a great impact on our students when we work with them to set goals, problem solve, manage their emotions in a healthy way, try their best, safely take risks, and take responsibility for their actions. Based on the EWS indicators, attendance is an area of concern (17% of students have less than 90% attendance). These SEL skills can help students find success in the classroom personally, socially, and academically, which will result in higher student attendance.

Measurable Outcome: 12% of students have less than 90% attendance (down from 17%)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 7 Mindset lessons are being implemented this year. Teachers can submit positive referrals for students to receive a phone call home from the principal, emphasizing the mindset for which they are being recognized. Each month, a student is selected from each class for demonstrating the Mindset of the month. The guidance counselor provides SEL lessons in the classrooms. School leaders meet with every student to help them set goals and celebrate achieved goals. PBIS strategies are used throughout the school, including a room where students can calm down with an adult and reflect on their choices, preparing to return to the classroom in a positive and efficient manner. An SEL committee was established to provide daily lessons for the first 15 days of school to help students return to school after COVID in a positive way.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS strategies and interventions help increase student engagement and success. The reason for choosing this is that when students find success and engagement at school, they are highly more likely to come to school regularly.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of 7 Mindsets (lessons, monthly student recognition, phone calls home, etc.)

Person Responsible Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Provide SEL lessons in the classroom.

Person Responsible April Senters (april.senters@myoneclay.net)

Set and celebrate goals with students.

Person Responsible Kristi Mineo (kristi.mineo@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student engagement is critical as we have over 100 students enrolled in One Clay Online. This is also critical for our students in brick and mortar. Student engagement is key to learning gains and proficiency. EWS indicators show engagement to be an area of concern based on attendance and behavior.

Measurable Outcome: Improved state test scores and teacher administered assessments will demonstrate improved student engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The technology lead at Doctors Inlet will provide up to date online resources, trainings, and tools to keep students engaged in online classrooms. Professional Learning Communities will be offered to provide support in student engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This was chosen based on EWS indicators and the need for online learning due to COVID 19. Whether in brick and mortar or online, the use of up to date resources and technology is key in increasing student engagement.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide online resources, trainings, and tools to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible Lauren Paine (ldpaine@oneclay.net)

Offer PLCs to support student engagement.

Person Responsible Kristi Mineo (kristi.mineo@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In order to increase math learning gains in our lowest quartile, students will receive small group instruction and regular individualized instruction through online iReady lessons.

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.

A weekly newsletter is sent to all parents and guardians highlighting activities within the school, photos, and upcoming events. Staff receive a weekly newsletter via email with updates and staff recognition. Students are recognized for positive behaviors aligned with the 7 Mindsets with a phone call placed to parents or guardians. Monthly student recognition for students recognized from each classroom who demonstrate the monthly trait aligned with The 7 Mindsets. SAC meets regularly to discuss school plans. PBIS team meets monthly and members communicate information to relative stakeholder groups.

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