

Clay County Schools

Fleming Island 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fleming Island Elementary School

4425 LAKESHORE DR, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fie.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Collins

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fleming Island Elementary School

4425 LAKESHORE DR, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fie.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	No	22%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

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

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.

We will prepare our students to be independent life-long learners. We will provide a learning environment that is centered on our students, directed by our teachers, and supported by our homes and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Children are the future. We are dedicated to academic excellence and their success!

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
Geiger, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade
Tully, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten
Collins, Jennifer	Principal	Principal
Doane, Lana	Teacher, K-12	1st grade
Sherman, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade
Barnard, Robin	Teacher, K-12	5th grade
Oswald, Melanie	Instructional Technology	Computer Teacher
Dover, Julie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Mana, Christine	Teacher, ESE	ESE PreK Teacher
Stininger, Renee	Teacher, ESE	ESE PreK Teacher, Team Lead for ESE
Luke, Jami	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade ELA Teacher; 3rd Grade Team Lead
Johnson, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade ELA Teacher, 6th Grade Lead Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Jennifer Collins

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

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)	22%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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	84	99	83	82	100	94	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
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	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	106	72	88	106	105	93	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	663
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	106	72	88	106	105	93	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	663
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	82%	65%	57%	83%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	62%	58%	76%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	54%	53%	73%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	70%	63%	81%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	66%	62%	79%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	56%	51%	68%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	85%	65%	53%	78%	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	80%	68%	12%	58%	22%
	2018	76%	68%	8%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	64%	14%	58%	20%
	2018	84%	62%	22%	56%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	90%	62%	28%	56%	34%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	75%	64%	11%	54%	21%
	2018	83%	63%	20%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	71%	10%	62%	19%
	2018	74%	70%	4%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	69%	14%	64%	19%
	2018	83%	66%	17%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	91%	64%	27%	60%	31%
	2018	82%	65%	17%	61%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	88%	70%	18%	55%	33%
	2018	90%	68%	22%	52%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	82%	63%	19%	53%	29%
	2018	74%	64%	10%	55%	19%
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	55	53	50	64	65	60	60				
BLK	69			77							
HSP	80	46		67	69						
MUL	90	64		76	64						
WHT	81	70	65	89	83	76	88				
FRL	75	71	60	68	56	33	90				
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	48	49	59	56	60	66	54				
BLK	50	64		50	64						
HSP	81	82		72	82						
MUL	75	88		75	94						

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
WHT	80	71	70	85	82	76	75				
FRL	63	56	53	66	69	76	75				
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	53	66	64	50	69	58	50				
BLK	65	73		71	73						
HSP	88	85		77	85		73				
MUL	75	75		75	75						
WHT	84	75	73	82	79	67	77				
FRL	64	65	65	64	73	53	81				

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	76
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	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	73
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	66
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	74
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	79
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	65
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.

6th grade reading showed the lowest performance during the school year. This is a 8% decrease from the prior year. We had a large group of students with level 1's from the prior year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is the reading lowest 25%. This component has decreased 10% over the past two years. One factor for this decline is that we are not correctly identifying students in the lowest 25%. Also, our small groups may not be addressing students' specific areas of need.

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.

Our students outperformed the state in every area.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in Science where there was a 8% increase in proficiency. The fifth grade science teacher taught all of the students and utilized the baseline Science assessment data to design lessons for students. In addition, she used hands on experiments and labs, as well as models, including of the human body.

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

One area of concern that continues to remain of concern is attendance. We have worked closely in this area by creating our Attendance Intervention Team and school-wide contests. Our Attendance Intervention Team meets monthly and alongside with our social worker, works with families to bring awareness and provide incentives for student attendance. However, we still have students with high percentages of absenteeism.

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

1. Lowest 25% in Reading
2. Overall gains in Reading
3. Lowest 25% in Math
4. Students with Disabilities Proficiency in Reading and Math
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus will be on ensuring that identified students in the lowest 25% make gains in Reading. Over the past three years, there has been a steady decline in the reading gains of students in the lowest 25%. In 16-17, 73% of students in the lowest 25% made gains in reading. In 18-19, 63% of students in the lowest 25% made gains in reading. That is a 10% decline in the lowest 25% of students in reading who are making gains. This area is important because it addresses the needs of one of our most fragile groups, students who have been identified as part of the lowest quartile, according to the 2018-2019 FSA data.

Measurable Outcome: This year, 67% of students in the lowest 25% will make gains in reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize standards based, differentiated activities through centers to provide remediation and/or enrichment to address student strengths and weaknesses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers utilize activities and lessons that are aligned to standards and student needs, then students will receive instruction that is at their level and will help students to make gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% in Reading.
2. Teachers will participate in professional development on standards based centers, understanding the Florida standards, and grade appropriate materials.
3. Teachers will provide small group instruction that target the needs of students in the lowest 25%.
4. Teachers will meet in PLC common planning groups weekly to analyze data and determine next steps for students in the lowest 25% in reading.
5. Leadership team will monitor the progress of students in the lowest 25% in reading.
6. Teachers and administration will be meet quarterly in data chats to discuss progress of students in the lowest 25%.

Person Responsible Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: An area of focus in which we will focus on is the overall gains in the subject area of reading. Over the past three years, there has been a steady decline in the reading gains for all students. In 16-17, 76% of students made gains in reading overall. In 17-18, 72% of students made gains in reading overall. In 18-19, 68% of students made gains in reading overall. That has resulted in an 8% decline of overall student reading gains.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year, 72% of students will make gains in Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize Reading LAFS curriculum daily with students in grades 2-6. In addition, teachers will implement daily centers that have materials that are research and standards based as well as differentiated to meet students' varying needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading LAFS is a research based curriculum that is on grade level and exposes students to rigorous texts and tasks. It also provides scaffolded instruction to students with modeling, guided instruction, and independent practice. In addition, center activities provide students with the opportunity to engage in tasks that are on their level and provide remediation and/or enrichment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will receive ongoing training in Reading LAFS.
2. Teachers will utilize district curriculum maps to guide their planning and instruction.
3. Teachers will analyze weekly student independent practice to determine if continued support is needed.
4. Students will receive small group, teacher-led instruction on areas of need.

Person Responsible: Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students' social and emotional health is critical in ensuring that students are ready to learn. During the 2019-2020 school year, our third, fourth, fifth, and sixth graders took the Panorama survey. This survey showed that 48% of our students regulated their emotions well (Emotion Regulation). This area includes students' ability to control their emotions, pull themselves out of a bad mood, relax when they are upset, and how calm they are able to stay. This is an area in which we can focus so that students have a positive attitude which result in classroom readiness to learn.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, 60% of our students will positively regulate their emotions as measured by the Panorama survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize the 7 Mindsets curriculum. The 7 Mindsets have been designed to promote self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making in students. This is a research based program that will positively help with the emotional regulation of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A school-wide program that can be supported by all teachers, the counselors, and administration will help all students. By implementing this school-wide, students will see the themes integrated into all classes and resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The PBIS team will meet to look at the 7 mindsets material and establish a timeline for implementation.
2. Teachers will receive professional development by the PBIS team for implementation.
3. The leadership team and administration will present the timeline for implementation.
4. Teachers will implement the 7 mindset curriculum in their classrooms with students.
5. The PBIS team will meet monthly to review and modify (if needed) the implementation.

Person Responsible: Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Lowest 25% Proficiency in Math

Teachers will identify the lowest 25% in Math as measured by the FSA. The teachers will provide instruction for these students by providing daily, standards-based, differentiated centers that address student identified deficiencies. Teachers will review data with the leadership team on a monthly basis to look at student progress. The district Math specialist will work with teachers on providing resources to teachers to utilize in small groups, including MAFS.

Students with Disabilities proficiency in Reading and Math

Administration will create a master schedule that provides time for ESE support facilitators to push into classrooms and provide small group instruction. Support facilitators will provide small group instruction on a daily basis to SWD students that is differentiated and meets individual student needs. Support facilitators will work with the general education teacher to analyze student data and progress. Support facilitators will provide Leveled Literacy Intervention to provide additional targeted support in reading. The ESE staffing specialist will have monthly trainings with ESE teachers to provide support and interventions.

Attendance

The school will have an Attendance Intervention Team which will consist of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, and Social Worker. The Attendance Intervention Team will meet once a month to review attendance data. For any students that have below an 85% attendance rate, the team will reach out to parents to schedule an attendance meeting. The purpose of the attendance meeting will be to partner with the family and work on ways to improve student attendance in school.

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.

Fleming Island Elementary School values a positive school culture and environment, and the staff works tirelessly to ensure that all stakeholders are involved. FIE staff members work at building positive relationships with families to increase involvement by communicating our mission and vision and keeping parents informed of their child's progress. The FOCUS parent portal serves as an instrument to keep parents informed. Publications are distributed throughout the year in various forms to communicate with families, such as the Parent and Student Handbook, The BARB monthly newsletter, FIE website, weekly email, robo-calls, and Facebook. The School Advisory Council and Parent Faculty Association establish communication and build relationships with families. FIE seeks to involve the family and community of

Fleming Island through our virtual orientations, open houses, and parent/teacher conferences. The PFA and SAC meet regularly as well and focus on school improvement. Our Partners in Education, which are local businesses, help provide financial and in-kind donations, to help support school programs and materials. School-wide, we also have a character education program in which we focus on a character trait each month. This year, we will also be implementing the 7 Mindsets program throughout our school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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