

Clay County Schools

Lake Asbury 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lake Asbury Junior High School

2851 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://laj.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Lydia Creel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	43%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lake Asbury Junior High School

2851 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://laj.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	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones , Justin	Assistant Principal	Maintain facilities and monitor student progress.
Alfano, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Carraway, Telissa	Teacher, K-12	
Fulenwider, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	
Wanek, Judy	Paraprofessional	
McConnell, Mallory	Principal	<p>Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. Coordinate school advisory council activities and implement a school improvement plan. Coordinate efficient utilization of school facilities and insure proper security, maintenance and cleanliness of the campus. Be responsible for the timely and accurate submission of all required school records/reports and the accurate entry of information into the district database. Provide leadership by participating in professional development activities and encouraging the professional development of instructional support and administrative staff including training to accurately report FTE participation, student performance, teacher appraisal, school safety, and discipline data. Be responsible for effective business management operations, the development of a school budget and efficient cost accounting. Maintain standards of appropriate student conduct through fair and equitable enforcement of the Clay County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct. Be responsible for faithfully and effectively implementing school/district personnel procedures including: interviewing, hiring, evaluating school staff and coordinating the Teacher Induction Program, and administering master contracts. Coordinate supervision of extra-curricular activities and duty assignments. Provide a safe learning environment through preparation and implementation of emergency evacuation plans, fire drills, etc.. Be responsible for implementing programs designed to meet the needs of special student populations (Ex. ESE, Title I, Dropout Prevention, etc.). Assure that the school meets all State and Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation standards. Be responsible for proper receipt and accounting of all school board property and maintaining an accurate property inventory. Provide for the purchase of appropriate textbooks, equipment and other instructional materials necessary to meet the needs of the students. Serve on district wide committees when requested. Be responsible for the development and implementation of a school technology plan. Be responsible for the performance of all</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>personnel employed by the School Board and assigned to the school site. Provide for the development of an individual Teacher Training Plan for each teacher assigned to school. Provide leadership for the implementation of the Florida Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Provide leadership in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, Florida Standards Assessments, End-of-Course exams, and other tests designed and adopted to measure student achievement. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with parents, staff, students and community. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus. Serve as coach/mentor to Assistant Principals, new Principals or others who are preparing for School Principal certification. Provide leadership for all stakeholders in the development of school beliefs, vision, mission, and goals and align them with the district mission, school improvement, and curriculum. Perform other duties as assigned by the Superintendent consistent with the goals and objectives of the position.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Lydia Creel

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

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)	43%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549	551	0	0	0	0	1100	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	99	0	0	0	0	201	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	48	0	0	0	0	106	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	149	0	0	0	0	207	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	65	0	0	0	0	129	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	50	0	0	0	0	126	
	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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567	584	0	0	0	0	1151	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	567	584	0	0	0	0	1151
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	65%	61%	54%	61%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	58%	54%	63%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	47%	48%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	67%	69%	58%	68%	69%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	63%	57%	67%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	56%	51%	51%	53%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	66%	51%	59%	60%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	84%	81%	72%	86%	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	60%	59%	1%	52%	8%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	51%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
	2018	74%	67%	7%	58%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	66%	63%	3%	54%	12%
	2018	66%	58%	8%	54%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	38%	49%	-11%	46%	-8%
	2018	57%	52%	5%	45%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	72%	64%	8%	48%	24%
	2018	73%	67%	6%	50%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	84%	80%	4%	71%	13%
2018	86%	78%	8%	71%	15%
Compare		-2%			
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	97%	66%	31%	62%	35%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	64%	30%	57%	37%
2018	100%	61%	39%	56%	44%
Compare		-6%			

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	32	47	39	35	41	29	43	55	60		
ELL	31	47	50	38	38						
ASN	91	87		87	52		92	100	88		
BLK	54	52	44	54	44	32	51	80	79		
HSP	55	58	50	58	54	57	65	80	76		
MUL	63	63	45	67	53	38	64	89	65		
WHT	67	61	45	69	53	43	76	84	78		
FRL	55	56	41	57	49	39	67	78	70		

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	32	45	42	39	60	52	40	63	45		
ASN	91	91		87	74		82	91	100		
BLK	56	59	56	57	69	55	58	77	55		
HSP	60	59	41	62	66	41	68	76	73		
MUL	61	65	62	68	66	65	73	88	79		
WHT	68	63	54	75	66	58	75	88	66		
FRL	59	62	52	63	66	55	66	80	54		
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	23	44	42	28	49	43	24	59	39		
ASN	79	67		84	67		70		90		
BLK	45	49	43	48	59	41	46	80	41		
HSP	63	70	46	62	63	49	52	82	64		
MUL	53	68	62	63	65	62	58	92	67		
WHT	63	62	49	72	69	52	62	86	53		
FRL	54	58	43	62	64	50	51	82	43		

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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	615
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	42
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	85
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	54
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	61
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	64
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was in the area of Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains. Some of the contributing factors were scheduling structures, teacher vacancies, and implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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 was Math Learning Gains. Some of the contributing factors were scheduling structures, teacher vacancies, and implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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 data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average (in a negative way) was in the area of Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains. Some of the contributing factors were scheduling structures, teacher vacancies, and implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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 the area of 8th Grade Science. Some of the contributing factors were teacher instruction and attention to grade level standards, remediation review cycles, and coaching cycles with teachers.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, some of our largest concerns are students with Level 1 and 2 performance levels on the FSA and attendance concerns.

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

1. Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Math Achievement
4. ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gains
5. ELA Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lake Asbury Junior High school has selected the above focus to directly impact the academic performance of our students. We believe by focusing on: grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations we will provide our students high quality instructional and academic experiences to directly grow their academic performance and outcomes.
Measurable Outcome:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. iReady Math and Reading scores will improve through growth monitoring assessments by 20% (Diagnostic 1- 2 and 2- 3). 2. Achieve 3000 Lexile scores will increase on monitoring assessments by 15% (Baseline to Mid-Year and Mid-Year to End-of-Year Assessments). 3. Civics scores will increase on monitoring assessments by 20% (Baseline to Mid-Year and Mid-Year to End-of-Year Assessments). 4. Science scores will increase on monitoring assessments by 15% (Baseline to Mid-Year and Mid-Year to End-of-Year Assessments).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly professional development sessions targeting these high quality instructional priorities. 2. Supported planning time through professional learning communities addressing standards aligned instruction and assignments. 3. Targeted feedback from school administration through walkthroughs related to the monthly instructional priority. 4. Instructional coaching cycles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delivering professional development sessions targeting these high quality instructional priorities will allow a systemic campus-wide vision for what these academic experiences should look like. 2. Supported planning will be paramount to strengthening instructional practices and reviewing the work expected from students. 3. Targeted feedback from walkthroughs will allow teachers the opportunities to continue instructional practices that are effectively impacting students or address any deficiencies in content delivery. 4. Instructional Coaching Cycles related to instructional priorities will be offered as an additional support as needed if school-based administration determines there are any deficiencies in content delivery.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Design a monthly professional development calendar for Academic and SEL alignment.
2. Implement a plan and deliver monthly professional development related to the four instructional priorities (grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations).
3. Attend and support weekly professional learning communities (PLC).
4. Monitor and support classroom learning through weekly walkthroughs.
5. Identify staff members to participate in instructional coaching cycles and support through the scope and sequence cycle as needed.

Person Responsible Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Lake Asbury Junior High school has selected the above focus to directly impact the academic performance of our students. We believe by tracking and counseling our lowest quartile students (with the help of our teachers), we will be able to directly impact our students and their academic performance and outcomes.</p> <p>We will use a data tracking system (created at LAJH) to monitor our teacher's highest need lowest quartile students. The data sheet will be introduced in October and monitored each month. We will use the sheet in collaboration with teachers to collect, monitor, and target student progress and success.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Our goals are for students to increase their...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. iReady Math and Reading scores will improve through growth monitoring assessments by 20% (Diagnostic 1- 2 and 2- 3). 2. Achieve 3000 Lexile scores will increase on monitoring assessments by 15% (Baseline to Mid-Year and Mid-Year to End-of-Year Assessments). 3. Civics scores will increase on monitoring assessments by 20% (Baseline to Mid-Year and Mid-Year to End-of-Year Assessments). 4. Science scores will increase on monitoring assessments by 15% (Baseline to Mid-Year and Mid-Year to End-of-Year Assessments).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly professional development sessions targeting instructional priorities that will impact our most struggling learners. 2. Supported planning time through professional learning communities addressing tracking student progress and allowing authentic time for teachers to work through data. This will be provided to administrators to counsel with students. 3. Targeted feedback from school administration through walkthroughs related to the monthly instructional priority. 4. Instructional coaching cycles with teachers on small group instruction and tracking student data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delivering professional development sessions targeting this will allow a systemic campus-wide vision for focusing on our most vulnerable learners. Administrators can model to students through individual data chats what their academic experiences should look like. 2. Supported planning will be paramount to strengthening instructional practices and reviewing the work expected from students. 3. Targeted feedback from walkthroughs will allow teachers the opportunities to continue instructional practices that are effectively impacting students or address any deficiencies in content delivery. 4. Instructional Coaching Cycles related to collecting data, reading data, and charting data will be used as an additional support as needed if school-based administration determines there are any deficiencies.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lake Asbury Junior High school has selected to use the 7 Mindsets program as the above focus to directly impact the social and emotional learning within our students. We believe if we focus on this area, we will see an increase in the academic performance of our students.

Measurable Outcome: 1. Decrease in the number of student Baker Acts by 2%.
2. Increased student involvement in activities, clubs, and sports by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 1. Quarterly professional development sessions targeting the 7 Mindsets through Faculty Meetings (leading by example).
2. Use of The 7 Mindsets Curriculum to address standards aligned instruction and activities during Tiger Time.
3. Counselors preparing pacing of the content to deliver material in a manageable time frame.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 1. If we use professional development sessions targeting the 7 Mindsets through Faculty Meetings (leading by example) we believe Faculty will feel empowered to deliver this material to students during Tiger Time. If teachers feel an increase in their own social and emotional learning, the impact will carry on to the students.
2. The use of The 7 Mindsets Curriculum will address the SEL standards the district has created. Counselors will work to align instruction and activities during Tiger Time for a campus-wide implementation.
3. If counselors preparing the pacing of the content to deliver material in a manageable time frame, students and teachers will have enough time to cover content and share about their experiences in an appropriate amount of class time. This will also allow teachers more time to talk to students without fear of having too short of time to cover material.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Design a monthly professional development calendar for SEL alignment.
2. Implement a plan and deliver monthly professional development related to the SEL priorities (counselors).
3. Monitor and support classroom learning through weekly walkthroughs during Tiger Time.
4. Monitor counselor blogs, SEL calendars, and lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Any additional priorities will be reviewed and addressed through leadership meetings to prioritize throughout the year.

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.

Lake Asbury Junior High has a variety of ways to build positive relationships with families and the community to increase involvement and our school culture. Teachers and administrators are readily accessible through conferences, email, Facebook, and classroom websites. Our communication plan is using phone calls home, social media, and our school website to inform and document events happening within the school. We listen to families and invite them to share ideas through surveys and the School Advisory Council. Parents can check their child's progress at anytime by logging into Focus Parent Portal.

Even with all these ways to communicate, it is important to use our community as an additional way to bring collaboration to our school building. We partner with organizations such as Lowes, Winn Dixie, local churches, and many other small businesses to ensure all are aware of our campus.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00