

Clay County Schools

Thunderbolt Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Thunderbolt Elementary School

2020 THUNDERBOLT RD, Fleming Island, FL 32003

<http://tbe.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Amy Bathurst

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
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 (73%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	21

Thunderbolt Elementary School

2020 THUNDERBOLT RD, Fleming Island, FL 32003

<http://tbe.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission statement of Thunderbolt Elementary is to provide a safe academic environment in which children and staff are encouraged to strive for excellence in scholarship and sociability while showing respect for self and others.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Thunderbolt Elementary prepares life-long learners to attain academic and applicable life skills that lead to success in a global and competitive workplace.

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
Stewart, Trisha	Assistant Principal	Monitor student progress and maintain facilities.
Libretto, Lara	Assistant Principal	Monitor student progress and maintain facilities.
Bell, Shelley	School Counselor	Classroom guidance lessons, small group, and monitor student behavior.
Rentz, Cynthia	School Counselor	Classroom guidance lessons, small group, and monitor student behavior.

Vann, Amy
Principal

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,

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Amy Bathurst

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.*

10

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
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 (73%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	115	102	134	107	114	142	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	837
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	1	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	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/1/2020

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	105	139	109	117	130	126	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	880
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	8	2	0	2	2	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	19	23	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	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	65%	57%	80%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	62%	58%	70%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	64%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	70%	63%	78%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	66%	62%	70%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	56%	51%	64%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	65%	53%	66%	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	85%	68%	17%	58%	27%
	2018	74%	68%	6%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	64%	10%	58%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	78%	62%	16%	56%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	81%	62%	19%	56%	25%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	84%	64%	20%	54%	30%
	2018	80%	63%	17%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	71%	12%	62%	21%
	2018	79%	70%	9%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	69%	5%	64%	10%
	2018	82%	66%	16%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	81%	64%	17%	60%	21%
	2018	90%	65%	25%	61%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	82%	70%	12%	55%	27%
	2018	83%	68%	15%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	63%	14%	53%	24%
	2018	84%	64%	20%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	65	55	41	74	79	80	66				
ELL	42	53	42	55	59	50					
ASN	88	67		92	89						
BLK	77	75		74	66		67				
HSP	69	63	60	72	63	53	74				
MUL	83	69		83	69						
WHT	85	74	61	84	73	69	86				
FRL	74	70	56	76	74	71	65				
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	59	62	44	67	73	77	68				
ELL	67	80		80	80						
ASN	86	83		91	83						
BLK	73	57	47	80	80	71	67				
HSP	76	50	50	80	81	80	93				
MUL	77	75		81	100						
WHT	81	69	55	85	82	73	84				
FRL	74	67	60	77	80	68	74				
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	60	62	53	63	62	54	43				
ELL	60	73		40	58						
ASN	96	78		88	89						
BLK	68	80	67	61	43	36	57				
HSP	74	69	58	77	67	60	76				
MUL	82	79		82	68		46				
WHT	82	68	64	79	73	70	68				
FRL	65	68	61	67	62	54	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	72
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	579

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
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	52
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	84
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	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	76
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	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The fourth-grade reading showed the lowest performance during the 2018-2019 school year. There was a 4% decrease from the 17-18 school year.

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

Fourth-grade math showed the lowest performance during the 2018-2019 school year. This was an 8% decrease from the 2017-2018 school year. There was also a 5% decrease in the cohort's performance from 3rd to 4th grades. Differentiated/small group instruction, as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, were not implemented with fidelity throughout the grade level.

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.

Thunderbolt Elementary out-performed the state in each tested area.

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

Third-grade reading showed the most improvement during the 2018-2019 school year. There was an 11% increase from the 2017-2018 school year. Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) was utilized in 3rd

grade to reach out lowest level learners and differentiated instruction was implemented with fidelity throughout most of the grade level.

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

The two potential areas of concern are our Level 1's (ELA and math) and suspensions.

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

1. Overall ELL achievement - reading and math.
2. SWD proficiency in reading and math
3. LQ gains in math
4. LQ gains in reading
5. Science achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Reading Lowest 25%

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Over the past four years, there has been inconsistency (increase one year followed by a decrease the next year) in the reading gains of students in the lowest 25%. For example, 2016 scores indicated 51% of our lowest 25% made gains in reading. In 2016, 64% of our students in the lowest 25% made reading gains. In 2017, 55% of our LQ students made reading gains. In 2018, 59% of our lowest 25% made reading gains.

Measurable Outcome: For the 20-21 school year, 60% of our students in the lowest quartile will make gains in reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Vann (amy.vann@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize standards-based, differentiated activities/tasks through small group instruction to provide remediation and/or enrichment to address students' strengths and weaknesses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers utilize activities/tasks and lessons that are aligned to the standards and student needs then students will receive instruction that is targeted to their level and result in student gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% in reading.
2. Teachers will participate in professional development on standards-based, small group instruction, understanding the standards, and grade-appropriate materials.
3. Teachers will meet with grade level/content colleagues weekly to analyze data and determine the next steps for students in the lowest 25%.
4. Leadership will monitor the progress of students in the lowest 25%.
5. Teachers and administrators will meet quarterly in data chats to review the progress of students in the lowest 25%.

Person Responsible: Amy Vann (amy.vann@myoneclay.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Students with Disabilities, Proficiency in Reading and Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have a large population of self-contained and inclusion students in our school. In comparison to the overall school proficiency in reading and math, the SWD's have a significant gap in proficiency as compared to the overall school population. During the 18-19 school year, the overall proficiency in reading was 82%; however, the proficiency in the SWD subgroup was 65%. During the 18-19 school year, the overall proficiency in math was 82%; however, the proficiency in SWD's subgroup was 74%.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 20-21 school year, 67% of students in the ELA SWD subgroup will be proficient. During the 20-21 school year, 75% of the Math SWD subgroup will be proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Vann (amy.vann@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE self-contained and inclusion teachers work with students with disabilities on a daily basis to provide appropriate and differentiated tasks and activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities have goals in their IEP's that must be met and objectives that help teachers provide the support to achieve those goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will create a master schedule that provides time for ESE support facilitators to push into classrooms and provide small-group instruction in reading and math.
2. Support facilitators will provide small group instruction on a daily basis to SWD's that is differentiated and meets individual student needs.
3. Support facilitators will work with the general education teachers to analyze student data and progress.
4. Support facilitators will utilize Leveled Literacy Instruction to provide additional targeted support in reading.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Social-Emotional Learning Area of Focus will be reducing discipline referrals for the 20-21 school year. When students receive a discipline referral, their learning is disrupted. Sometimes the disruption is short but other times it is longer. We identified this Area of Focus as a critical need based on the number of suspensions during the 19-20 school year.

Measurable Outcome: During the 19-20 school year, 4% of our total population received discipline referrals. During the 20-21 school year, we hope to reduce discipline referrals to 3% of our total population.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Vann (amy.vann@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Clay County School District has implemented, county-wide, The 7 Mindsets by Shickler and Waller. The 7 Mindsets curriculum is centered on Blooms Taxonomy and aligned to 10 Social and Emotional Learning Core Competencies. Our school guidance counselors, as well as our teachers, will facilitate lessons to all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting The 7 Mindsets equips students with principles that help them take ownership of their lives, focus their time and energy, and positively impact the world around them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide launch of the 7 Mindsets portal, which the Clay County School District added to our digital resources.
2. Throughout the 20-21 school year, teachers are completing self-paced modules that focus on 7 Mindset principles and how to teach them with fidelity and optimal impact.
3. Gather school SEL team to discuss our implementation plan.
4. Review and monitor that 7 Mindset lessons are being facilitated and monitor discipline data.

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.

The two potential areas of concern are our Level 1's (ELA and math) and suspensions.

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.

Our Social-Emotional Learning Area of Focus will be reducing discipline referrals for the 20-21 school year. When students receive a discipline referral, their learning is disrupted. Sometimes the disruption is short but other times it is longer. We identified this Area of Focus as a critical need based on the number of suspensions during the 19-20 school year.

Thunderbolt will implement 7 Mindsets Curriculum.

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: Other: Reading Lowest 25%	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Students with Disabilities, Proficiency in Reading and Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00