

Clay County Schools

# Shadowlawn 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>20</b> |

# Shadowlawn Elementary School

2945 COUNTY ROAD 218, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://sle.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Whitney Johnson**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/8/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-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)  | 50%   |
| <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 (67%)<br>2017-18: B (58%)<br>2016-17: B (61%)<br>2015-16: B (61%)  |
| <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> .   |   |

## 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>20</b> |

## Shadowlawn Elementary School

2945 COUNTY ROAD 218, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://sle.oneclay.net>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-6                        | No                     | 39%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 18%  |

### School Grades History

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

Shadowlawn Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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

Shadowlawn Elementary's 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.

### 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   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Crowder, Nancy     | Principal           | Leadership Team will meet monthly to review global school data, address concerns of the faculty, review school operations and safety, ensure systems are in place for smooth running of the campus, etc. The Leadership Team will serve an active role in adherence to our PBIS implementation. |
| Studer, Lauren     | Teacher, K-12       |   |
| Schmidt, Barbara   | Teacher, K-12       |   |
| Adair, Kim         | Teacher, K-12       |   |
| Hillis, Shannon    | Teacher, K-12       |   |
| Johnson, Whitney   | Assistant Principal |   |
| Myers-Fox, June    | Teacher, K-12       |   |
| Morris, Megan      | Teacher, K-12       |   |
| Pilkinton, Frances | Teacher, K-12       |   |
|                    |                     |   |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 9/8/2020, Whitney Johnson

**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.*

4

**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.*

7

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

34

**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>PK-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)  | 50%   |
| <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 (67%)<br>2017-18: B (58%)<br>2016-17: B (61%)<br>2015-16: B (61%)  |
| <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               | 89          | 95 | 78 | 96 | 98 | 78 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 654   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

### 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     | 100         | 91 | 98 | 91 | 85 | 108 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 668   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2   | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| 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  | 7  | 12 | 15  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**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     | 4           | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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     | 100         | 91 | 98 | 91 | 85 | 108 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 668   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2   | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| 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  | 7  | 12 | 15  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |

**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 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**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     | 4           | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

## 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             | 68%    | 65%      | 57%   | 68%    | 62%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 63%    | 62%      | 58%   | 66%    | 61%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 60%    | 54%      | 53%   | 48%    | 54%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 74%    | 70%      | 63%   | 66%    | 64%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 74%    | 66%      | 62%   | 60%    | 60%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 71%    | 56%      | 51%   | 50%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 60%    | 65%      | 53%   | 71%    | 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 | 81%    | 68%      | 13%                        | 58%   | 23%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 74%    | 68%      | 6%                         | 57%   | 17%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 71%    | 64%      | 7%                         | 58%   | 13%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 62%      | -5%                        | 56%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 14%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 54%    | 62%      | -8%                        | 56%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 56%    | 59%      | -3%                        | 55%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 66%    | 64%      | 2%                         | 54%   | 12%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 55%    | 63%      | -8%                        | 52%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 81%    | 71%      | 10%                        | 62%   | 19%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 76%    | 70%      | 6%                         | 62%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 76%    | 69%      | 7%                         | 64%   | 12%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 53%    | 66%      | -13%                       | 62%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 23%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 51%    | 64%      | -13%                       | 60%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 63%    | 65%      | -2%                        | 61%   | 2%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 82%    | 70%      | 12%                        | 55%   | 27%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 81%    | 68%      | 13%                        | 52%   | 29%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 19%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 61%    | 63%      | -2%                        | 53%   | 8%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 69%    | 64%      | 5%                         | 55%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 45       | 50     | 60          | 54        | 69      | 70           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 52       | 58     |             | 74        | 84      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 70     |             | 79        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 58       | 53     |             | 63        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 63     | 61          | 74        | 72      | 70           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 54     | 58          | 67        | 69      | 71           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 35       | 41     | 45          | 46        | 55      | 44           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 48       | 61     |             | 67        | 68      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 61       | 50     |             | 68        | 56      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 67       | 50     |             | 67        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| WHT                                       | 61       | 49     | 38          | 70        | 65      | 44           | 73       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 49     | 47          | 66        | 62      | 48           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 36       | 51     | 43          | 33        | 38      | 49           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 56       | 55     |             | 72        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 75       | 68     |             | 69        | 65      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 67       | 80     |             | 73        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 66     | 50          | 65        | 60      | 53           | 72       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 57       | 60     | 54          | 60        | 59      | 48           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 67  |
| 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                                       | 470 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |

| Subgroup Data   |     |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 55  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                 |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%  | 0   |

| Native American Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students   |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 67  |
| 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  | 75  |
| 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   | 62  |
| 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                                | 60  |
| 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.**

5th grade ELA/Math/Science - lowest proficiency. This cohort of students had historically been the lowest performing cohort in previous grades. This cohort was comprised of a large population of SWD. Class size was also higher in this grade level. 5th grade has consistently been our lowest performing group which is reflective of trends across the District and the State. Our 5th grade Science scores have been at or below the State average for the last 3-4 years.

\*\*These students are no longer at SLE - they are in 7th grade.

In planning for improvement, 5th grade Science will be a priority with this current year's cohort.

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

5th grade Science - this cohort of students has consistently performed lower than other cohorts on FSA in grades 3 and 4. This cohort was comprised of a large SWD subgroup. The cohort also included a growing number of 5th grade students who were new registrations at our school and the CCSD. \*\*These students are no longer at SLE - they are in 7th grade.

Historically, the last 3-4 years, 5th grade Science has consistently been our lowest area of proficiency. Contributing to this decline as one factor is a need to apply additional time and resources to teaching the 3rd/4th grade Fair Game standards prior to students entering the 5th grade.

#### **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 ELA and Math. As stated above, these students are no longer at SLE.

The SWD subgroup ELA Achievement was 45% and Science Achievement was 35%. No subgroup was below the 41% Federal Index. SWD was 55%. Our subgroup of SWD has increased and we have also experienced a trend in more students who are economically disadvantaged.

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

Our lower quartile gains were significant. Small group instruction was a priority and approached with a sense of urgency thru additional training of teachers in truly differentiating instruction and ensuring data was analyzed on small groups which documented fluidity of groups based on individual student need. Groups were skill based and students tracked their own data and were provided a greater ability to take ownership of their learning.

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

No subgroups were below 41% in the Federal Index for the current year. Students with Disabilities (SWD) were the lowest at 55%. This is a potential area of concern as our priority would be to see an increase in this percentage for our SWD subgroup.

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

1. 5th Grade Science & ELA
2. Addressing regression due to COVID19 and school closures for Students with Disabilities (SWD Subgroup)
3. Social Emotional regression due to COVID19 and school closures

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Due to the historical drop in 5th grade Science, Shadowlawn will focus on the protocol based literacy strategy, Read Discuss Read, to identify tier 3 vocabulary and their affixes and roots specific to Science. 5th grade Science covers standards from the 3rd to 5th grade with tier 3 vocabulary not received through direct exposure.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Students will be assessed using the 2020/2021 FSSA. Shadowlawn will increase by 5 percentage points and change the course of the historical data trend. 5th grade will monitor incremental changes to meet this outcome through district Science assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nancy Crowder (nancy.crowder@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Read Discuss Read will be the evidenced based strategy used to increase Science achievement through literacy in the 5th grade. Students will read for fluency, identify unknown vocabulary and their affixes and roots, then discuss the concept through text dependent questioning over the course of multiple reads.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Students need to have a deep comprehension of the Science text, so they are able to focus and conceptualize the standard rather than struggling through the text.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Inservice for teachers in implementation of CLOSE reading strategies(RDR).
2. Identification of tier 3 Science vocabulary aligned to NGSSS Science assessment.
3. Monthly data chats to discuss the progress monitoring of students.

**Person Responsible**

Nancy Crowder (nancy.crowder@myoneclay.net)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | While still ranking above the Federal index, SWD students are still struggling to perform at the proficiency levels of their non-disabled peers. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, SWD students have regressed from pre-Covid levels in Math and ELA based on the comparative cohort trends from the previous year. SWD students will require more individualized instruction through differentiation to close gaps and meet their individual needs. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | SWD students will return to the "on grade level" proficiency levels of 2019/2020 school year in Math and ELA by the final Iready diagnostic. This will require SWD to have a 1% proficiency level in Reading and a 4% proficiency level in Math. As of Iready diagnostic one for the 2020/2021 school year, SWD students have a proficiency level of 0% in Math and 1% in Reading.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Nancy Crowder (nancy.crowder@myoneclay.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Shadowlawn will utilize the Iready teacher tool-box to differentiate instruction through product, process, and content based on the the student's instructional profile provided by their Iready diagnostic.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Due to COVID19 and school closures, many students with disabilities struggled in the virtual based classroom, students will require individualized instruction to meet their individual needs in both Math and Science.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Monthly data chats to progress monitor the achievement levels and areas of opportunity for our SWD population
2. Attend weekly ESE team Professional Learning Communities to plan for student differentiation
3. Utilize the the Iready teacher toolbox for differentiated curriculum

**Person Responsible** Nancy Crowder (nancy.crowder@myoneclay.net)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** If all teachers implement the 7-Mindsets Social Emotional Learning(SEL) curriculum with fidelity and high expectations, then student's will develop self awareness, self-management, social and relationship skills and responsible decision making.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we implement a Social Emotional Learning curriculum to address DEF referrals(defiance, disrespect, and insubordination) which accounted for 21% of our 2019/2020 referrals, then we should see a drop in this category in the 2020/2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

The 7 Mindsets provides targeted Social Emotional Learning for students which addresses social situations and expectation for pro-social interaction. Each month will tackle a different characteristic for SEL development.

The schedule you will follow when teaching the lessons was developed by Clay County and aligned to the character ed crosswalk:

October: 100% Accountable

**Evidence-based Strategy:** November & December: Attitude of Gratitude

January: We are Connected

February: Live to Give

March: Everything is Possible

April: Passion First

May: The Time is Now

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** In an effort to meet the social emotional and mental and behavioral needs of students and staff, an SEL team will be implemented. Our measurable outcome will be addressed via a decrease in the number of discipline referrals.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Establish the SLE 7 Mindsets team
2. Attend monthly 7 Mindstends school-based Professional Learning Communities
3. Follow the district crosswalk for 7 Mindsets implementation

**Person Responsible** Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The school leadership team will address these Areas of Focus through Leadership team meetings. During these meetings data will be analyzed among science classes to ensure that students are progressing through the science standards. Guidance counselor will provide updates on how the SEL is progressing among students and number of guidance referrals and our "7 Mindsets" team will provide updates and activities to encourage student.**

## 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.

Shadowlawn Elementary is a community school. Our various business partners support our students and families through donations of time and incentives for our students, volunteering at school events including our annual highlight event "Breakfast with Santa". First United Methodist Church of Middleburg hosts a "backpack ministry" in providing backpacks full of non-perishable food for approximately 20 of our families. Middleburg Marshall Arts provides karate lessons free of charge periodically for our students. During the holidays, SLE provides Thanksgiving and Christmas gift baskets to families. We also provide Christmas gifts to our students whose families may need assistance. Our business partners and parents always make a strong contribution to these efforts.

Our SLE Parent Volunteer Organization (PVO) assists with school picture days, health screenings and fundraising. This group also assists teachers as homeroom volunteers with various tasks teachers may need. (Many of these opportunities are currently impacted by COVID restrictions.)

We have implemented for the last 3 years Positive Referrals for students. Any staff member has access to the Positive Referral form and can recognize a student for exemplary leadership in following our Falcon Guidelines for Success and/or setting the example for others in acts of kindness towards others. The student is recognized by SLE Administration and given a small treat bag. A phone call is made home to the parent.

SLE also recognizes once a month "Falcon Leaders". Teachers choose a student monthly who has exemplified strong leadership traits. The students are invited to a snowcone social and receive a certificate to take home which has been completed by the teacher honoring the student.

Our SLE School Advisory Council (SAC) meets at least quarterly (4 times per year). This committee is comprised of parents, business partners, community members and SLE instructional & support staff. The committee not only reviews the SIP, but also works collaboratively to review schoolwide safety and

academic measures and concerns as well as providing input on school procedures, communication with all stakeholders and referrals to others who may be interested in serving on SAC or attending meetings. The committee has also assisted with seeking community members and businesses to donate time, items and funds to the school.

#### **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: Science                  | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities        | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |