
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Oakleaf High School

4035 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://ohs.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Boyack

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	39%
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 (64%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Oakleaf High School

4035 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://ohs.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)
High School PK, 9-12	No	29%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

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.

The mission of Oakleaf High School is to provide a safe, appropriate, and effective learning environment that will meet the needs and assist students in accomplishing educational goals that are significant for their college or career aspirations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

By providing the best education possible, we are giving our students the "armor" to succeed in their lifelong endeavors.

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
Boyack, Matthew	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 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>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thompson, Christina	Assistant Principal	AP for 10th grade Data Analysis & Monitoring Student Progress
Rains, Alethia	Teacher, K-12	
Wood, Tyler	Assistant Principal	AP for 11th Grade Data Analysis and Monitoring Student Progress
Linscomb, Lance	Dean	Dean of Discipline, 9th-12th
Haile, Toyia	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of 9th Grade Data Analysis and Monitoring Student Progress
Segreto, Deborah	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal over the 12th Grade Data Analysis and Monitoring Student Progress

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 10/1/2020, Matthew Boyack

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

134

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	39%
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 (64%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	0	0	678	614	622	603	2517
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	115	124	130	453
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	81	81	65	330
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	73	0	0	146

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	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	0
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 10/12/2020

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	0	0	654	675	679	596	2604
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	2	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	84	88	82	68	322

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	84	50	20	10	164

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	654	675	679	596	2604
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	2	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	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	84	88	82	68	322

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	84	50	20	10	164

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	61%	60%	56%	55%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	52%	51%	49%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	39%	42%	40%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	55%	51%	61%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	46%	48%	52%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	38%	45%	40%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	73%	68%	60%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	81%	73%	73%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	62%	61%	1%	55%	7%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	58%	57%	1%	53%	5%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	72%	2%	67%	7%
2018	85%	90%	-5%	65%	20%
Compare		-11%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	80%	3%	70%	13%
2018	80%	78%	2%	68%	12%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	65%	-13%	61%	-9%
2018	52%	66%	-14%	62%	-10%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	64%	0%	57%	7%
2018	57%	61%	-4%	56%	1%
Compare		7%			

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	25	50	54	24	28	18	54	52		91	35
ELL	24	50	56	47	59	50	36	70		82	50
ASN	78	57		71	64		94	94		100	74
BLK	50	49	41	53	50	35	70	76		94	58
HSP	61	57	58	58	52	31	73	78		96	65
MUL	69	62	50	63	63	27	76	91		97	48
WHT	66	60	50	64	53	40	79	90		96	68
FRL	51	52	48	50	42	26	65	76		95	53
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	24	41	40	22	39	31	82	44		87	40
ELL	37	53	50	41	46	35		46		71	83
ASN	82	53		81	65		95	96		96	78
BLK	49	52	47	42	42	30	83	71		96	58
HSP	58	57	49	54	55	42	86	79		91	73
MUL	63	56		60	51		100	83		91	81
WHT	66	56	49	65	58	45	91	86		93	73
FRL	50	53	48	47	47	36	81	75		90	59
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	18	35	31	25	45	43	18	51		83	12
ELL	15	39	38	41	50	35	28	29		69	
ASN	80	69		78	64		80	90		100	87
BLK	45	41	34	47	45	38	44	65		94	52
HSP	53	49	35	57	50	38	62	64		88	71
MUL	51	35		57	57		59	63		91	67

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
WHT	60	55	50	72	57	44	71	80		95	66
FRL	46	45	36	55	50	38	52	59		93	55

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	61
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	669
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	51
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	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	65
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	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Our lowest performing area was Learning Gains for LQ Math students. Our LQ students making gains was only 35%. Contributing factors included adjusting to a 1A/1B block format for all LQ students. Teachers are receiving additional training. Also, fewer students are taking Alg 1 at the high school (more at junior high) thus leaving the very lowest with Alg 1. Alg 1 is basically a remedial course at the high school.

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

Our largest drop was Learning Gains for LQ students in the area of ELA (-3) and Math (-3). Not including high student engagement activities and small group instruction for the LQ students contributed to the drop.

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.

Learning Gains for LQ students - State 45%, district-38% and OHS 35%. See the notes in section "A".

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

Bio proficiency- Our school goal was 72% but our actual proficiency rate was 75%. We had a great 10th grade Biology PLC and the 9th grade Environmental Science did a great job preparing students for Biology.

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

Number of student with attendance below 90%
Number of 9/10 students at level 1 on state wide assessments.

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

1. Learning Gains for our Math LQ students
2. Learning Gains for our ELA LQ students
3. Implement Social/Emotional Learning for all students
4. Increase teacher led small group instruction
5. Increase the amount of high cognition/high participation activities in classrooms.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We are focusing on LQ math gains. It is critical to focus on this subgroup because they are our neediest students. Many are several grades behind in math and our data indicated that only 35% made significant gains in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to improve from 35% LQ gains to 40% LQ gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christina Thompson (christina.thompson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Instruction and Collaborative planning through PLC's.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated small-group instruction focuses on the learning needs of each student. Collaborative planning through PLC's allow for our teachers to discuss best practices and plan for improved outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We are focusing on LQ ELA gains. It is critical to focus on this subgroup because they are our neediest students. Many are several grades behind in ELA and our data indicated that only 46% made significant gains in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is that 50% of our LQ ELA students make gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Matthew Boyack (matthew.boyack@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Instruction and Collaborative Planning through PLC's.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated small-group instruction focuses on the learning needs of each student. Collaborative planning through PLC's allow for our teachers to discuss best practices and plan for improved outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our area of focus will be reducing student tardies to class. Students' being late to class negatively impacts their performance in that class and their overall relationship with their teacher. Tardies were identified as our most common referral last year and the amount of missed class time negatively affected student performance.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to reduce student tardy referrals by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lance Linscomb (lance.linscomb@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We have improved traffic flow by adding sidewalks, crosswalks, and one-directional hallways. We have also made parent drop-off more efficient by manning it with school personnel. We have also removed lockers. Finally, we have teachers monitoring the hallways and they are not allowing students to stop and talk.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All of the above strategies decrease student travel times from class to class.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The administration team will meet weekly to discuss our goals and track our progress towards those goals. After having those meetings, each leader will meet bi-monthly with content area PLC's to discuss best practices, common assessments (data analysis), and how we will improve learning amongst our lower quartiles.

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.

We are building a positive school culture in the following ways:

1. Staff recognition "BINGO" buttons (staff recognizes colleagues)
2. Admin recognition of "Student of the Week" and "Staff Member of the Week"
3. Increased social media usage to bring parents and community timely information
4. Increased ParentLink communications to reach out directly to stakeholders with information that directly affects them.
5. One administrator's focus on building climate and culture within the school
6. An emphasis on SEL amongst teachers, staff, and students through 7 Mindsets
7. "Morning Mindset" read once a day

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00