

Clay County Schools

# Orange Park Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>19</b> |

# Orange Park Elementary School

1401 PLAINFIELD AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ope.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Tyler Wood**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 31%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (89%)<br>2017-18: A (85%)<br>2016-17: A (84%)<br>2015-16: A (73%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

# Orange Park Elementary School

1401 PLAINFIELD AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ope.oneclay.net>

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2019-20 Title I School</b> | <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>KG-6                               | No                            | 23%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(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.

Our mission is to always work collaboratively with all of our community resources and stakeholders. We will increase achievement among our students with opportunities surrounding learning that are relevant, rigorous, and will transcend beyond the boundaries of our school walls. Our working and learning environment will be built upon honesty, integrity and respect. With all of the above Orange Park Elementary will maximize student potential and also promote individual responsibility.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Orange Park Elementary exists to prepare lifelong learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring all applicable life skills. We will provide an experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children.

### 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                                    |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| McCullough, Carole | Principal           | Instructional leader of the school                                 |
| Herndon, Suzanne   | Assistant Principal | Assist the principal in providing quality instructional leadership |
| Geeser, Molly      | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Bachmayer, Abby    | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Lusk, Allison      | Teacher, ESE        |  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 9/28/2020, Tyler Wood

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

**Demographic Data**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 31%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (89%)<br>2017-18: A (85%)<br>2016-17: A (84%)<br>2015-16: A (73%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

**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               | 72          | 72 | 72 | 72 | 66 | 66 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 484   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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     | 1           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/29/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 73          | 72 | 70 | 70 | 66 | 65 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 478   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| One or more suspensions         | 2           | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| 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  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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           | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| 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     | 73          | 72 | 70 | 70 | 66 | 65 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 478   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| One or more suspensions         | 2           | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| 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  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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           | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 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             | 91%    | 65%      | 57%   | 88%    | 62%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 75%    | 62%      | 58%   | 82%    | 61%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 76%    | 54%      | 53%   | 77%    | 54%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 97%    | 70%      | 63%   | 87%    | 64%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 85%    | 66%      | 62%   | 83%    | 60%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 98%    | 56%      | 51%   | 79%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 100%   | 65%      | 53%   | 92%    | 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 | 93%    | 68%      | 25%                        | 58%   | 35%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 96%    | 68%      | 28%                        | 57%   | 39%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 94%    | 64%      | 30%                        | 58%   | 36%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 90%    | 62%      | 28%                        | 56%   | 34%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 92%    | 62%      | 30%                        | 56%   | 36%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 87%    | 59%      | 28%                        | 55%   | 32%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 85%    | 64%      | 21%                        | 54%   | 31%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 89%    | 63%      | 26%                        | 52%   | 37%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 96%    | 71%      | 25%                        | 62%   | 34%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 94%    | 70%      | 24%                        | 62%   | 32%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 99%    | 69%      | 30%                        | 64%   | 35%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 89%    | 66%      | 23%                        | 62%   | 27%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 95%    | 64%      | 31%                        | 60%   | 35%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 89%    | 65%      | 24%                        | 61%   | 28%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 97%    | 70%      | 27%                        | 55%   | 42%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 95%    | 68%      | 27%                        | 52%   | 43%                     |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 100%   | 63%      | 37%                        | 53%   | 47%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 94%    | 64%      | 30%                        | 55%   | 39%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 69       | 70     | 58          | 86        | 85      | 91           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 100      |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 83       | 77     |             | 95        | 85      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 85       | 74     |             | 97        | 79      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 94       | 71     |             | 94        | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 92       | 74     | 75          | 97        | 83      | 100          | 100      |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 84       | 69     | 70          | 95        | 85      | 95           | 100      |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 57       | 56     | 45          | 73        | 67      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 100      |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 83       | 81     |             | 89        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 96       | 83     |             | 92        | 92      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 82       | 55     |             | 82        | 91      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 91       | 77     | 85          | 92        | 84      | 74           | 96       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 88       | 79     | 78          | 89        | 80      | 73           | 87       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 63       | 76     | 69          | 56        | 60      | 60           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 100      | 91     |             | 100       | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 83       | 56     |             | 94        | 94      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 82       | 80     |             | 88        | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 90       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 88       | 84     | 81          | 86        | 83      | 76           | 96       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| FRL                                       | 91       | 71     |             | 83        | 73      | 73           | 95       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 89  |
| 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                                       | 622 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |

### Subgroup Data

#### Students With Disabilities

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 77 |
| 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                                | 100 |
| 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                                    | 85  |
| 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  | 84  |
| 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   | 90  |
| 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   | 89  |
| 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                                | 85  |
| 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.**

SWD Achievement in ELA only 69% (but did increase by 12% from 57% in 2018. Last year we had several SWD students enroll at OPE with severe reading issues.

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

6th grade ELA achievement declined by 4% (from 89% in 2018 to 85% in 2019). We honestly believe this small decline is due to the fact that we are comparing different groups of students.

**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.**

5th grade Science saw the biggest gap when compared to the state science scores. OPE=100% proficient while state scored only 53% proficient. This is a very positive gap. :)

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

4th grade math achievement increased by 10% (2018=89%; 2019=99%). Teachers are comfortable and very effective using the Go Math curriculum. OPE 4th grade teachers teach to all modalities.

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

No true area of concern as data is very positive.

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

1. Increase student achievement in ELA to offset the negative effects of crisis learning in spring, 2020.
2. Increase student achievement in Math to offset the negative effects of crisis learning in spring, 2020.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** While our scores from 2019 FSA are quite high, the baseline data from Fall 2020 iReady indicates there is a significant drop in student achievement. This is due to the crisis learning model of instruction and the fact that students haven't been in school for 5 months.

**Measurable Outcome:** 80% of students will increase reading achievement to levels that indicate on-grade level status as evidenced by iReady/Achieve 3000 end-of-year data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carole McCullough (carolyn.mccullough@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will use informal assessments to pin point the specific area of needed remediation and will differentiate instruction for all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Instructional practices and assessments included in the Reading Endorsement program support the strategy above.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Select and give informal assessments.
2. Using these informal assessments, in addition to iReady fall data, small groups will be formed based upon area(s) in need of remediation. Teachers will differentiate instruction taking place in each group.
3. Supplemental phonics resources will be purchased and used in small groups.

**Person Responsible:** Carole McCullough (carolyn.mccullough@myoneclay.net)



**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In order for students to thrive emotionally and academically they must feel safe. Our role - especially during the pandemic- is to ensure the safety of all students. Children have been out of school for at least 5 months. Coming back to brick and mortar - or connecting through OCO classes- students have to learn how to re-engage academically and socially.

**Measurable Outcome:** By spring, 2021, 90% of our students will indicate they feel safe at OPE.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Suzanne Herndon (suzanne.herndon@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will model and reinforce safety protocols and will have students collaborate and share ideas pertaining to school safety.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Modeling and collaboration are research- based & highly effective instructional strategies.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide a pre-assessment with basic questions concerning school safety.
2. All adults will role model appropriate behaviors for maintaining a safe campus.
3. The guidance counselor and school resource officer will work with groups of students, promoting school safety.
4. The pre-test given in the fall will be replicated in spring to determine levels of comfort within out students.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** While our scores from 2019 FSA are quite high, the baseline data from Fall 2020 iReady indicates there is a significant drop in student achievement. This is due to the crisis learning model of instruction and the fact that students haven't been in school for 5 months.

**Measurable Outcome:** 80% of students will increase math achievement to levels that indicate on-grade level status as evidences by iReady end-of-year data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carole McCullough (carolyn.mccullough@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Small groups will be formed based on data' instruction will be differentiated to meet each student's needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Small groups and differentiated instruction are proven best practices.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Select and give informal assessments.
2. Using these informal assessments, in addition to iReady fall data, small groups will be formed based upon area(s) in need of remediation. Teachers will differentiate instruction taking place in each group.
3. Math instruction will include the use of manipulatives;

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Our laser focus this year will be on raising reading and math achievement and maintaining a safe learning environment. No other priorities at this time.**

## 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.

Administrators at OPE place high regard to the idea of positive school culture and environment. Over the summer the two areas most used by teachers - the lounge and the workroom- were redecorated to promote a warm, home-like environment. Staff birthdays are celebrated monthly. Administrators stay late on a regular basis so that teachers can come talk about personal or professional concerns. Teams meet individually with administration once per month to discuss issues that are important to them. Intensive support has been provided to OCO teachers in the form of purchasing items needed to facilitate online learning and also bringing in experts from the district office to work along side our OCO teachers. Students enjoy a clean and inviting campus. CDC guidelines are being followed to the greatest extent possible. Students are given mask breaks throughout the day. Teachers are creative and provide high interest lessons for students. Administrators and the guidance counselor have an open door policy for staff and students. Parents are kept informed through multiple sources of information including an updated website, Peach Jar and FaceBook. Pictures of students are shared regularly. Positive citizenship expectations are reinforced through a monthly program entitled SOAR. Our guidance counselor conducts SEL lessons in all classrooms. The Orange Park Police Department supports OPE sixth grade students through the DARE program.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

**Part V: Budget**

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA          | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math         | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |