

Martin County School District

# Jensen Beach 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>

# Jensen Beach Elementary School

2525 NE SAVANNAH RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

[martinschools.org/o/jbe](http://martinschools.org/o/jbe)

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Radcliff**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</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 Martin 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>

# Jensen Beach Elementary School

2525 NE SAVANNAH RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

[martinschools.org/o/jbe](http://martinschools.org/o/jbe)

## 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-5	No	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Jensen Beach Elementary strives to foster a nurturing and safe school community. We provide a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success, allowing for individual differences and learning styles. We have a school-wide focus on urgency, importance, and teamwork. Parents, teachers, and community members are actively involved in our students' academic and social-emotional learning.

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

Educate all students for success in a global society.

### 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
Michels, Jennifer	Principal	
Law, Jamie	Assistant Principal	
Lunt, Alice	Teacher, ESE	
Joie, Jade	School Counselor	
Foohs, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 2/1/2019, Jennifer Radcliff

**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.*

2

**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**

38

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</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	78	81	89	91	104	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	7	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

#### 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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

#### 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Saturday 10/17/2020

#### 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	93	96	105	116	82	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	15	12	12	12	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	4	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

#### 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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

#### 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	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	93	96	105	116	82	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	15	12	12	12	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	4	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

**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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**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	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	66%	58%	57%	64%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	59%	58%	61%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	56%	53%	55%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	65%	63%	68%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	65%	62%	60%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	53%	51%	47%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	58%	53%	58%	55%	51%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	71%	55%	16%	56%	15%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	58%	7%	62%	3%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	67%	1%	64%	4%
	2018	73%	64%	9%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	69%	64%	5%	60%	9%
	2018	73%	64%	9%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	53%	10%	53%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	54%	12%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	46	43	40	49	53	33	58				
ELL	43	54		54	42						
HSP	62	65		64	58						
WHT	69	57	49	71	58	38	63				
FRL	50	50	42	49	51	30	50				
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	52	57	44	60	68	60	61				
ELL	38			62							
BLK	54	60		50	60						
HSP	66	83		53	70		67				
MUL	60										
WHT	67	59	41	73	74	59	68				
FRL	57	59	43	60	72	54	56				
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	43	61	45	53	46	25	46				
BLK	58			33							
HSP	53	43		66	52						
WHT	67	62	60	70	61	51	60				
FRL	56	58	62	57	49	46	43				

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	49
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	58
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	47
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.**

Only 37% of students in our lowest quartile made learning gains in math. This is down significantly from the previous year's data that shows 59% of the lowest quartile making learning gains in math. However, our trend shows this component is historically one of the lowest for our school. Contributing factors include lack of focus on intentional planning and lack of monitoring teacher lesson plans, teachers' limited understanding of the full intent of grade level standards, lack of pre-planned differentiated learning activities combined with pre-planned monitoring questions, and misalignment of daily activities to the full rigor of the standards.

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

Overall math learning gains and math learning gains of the lowest quartile both decreased by 18%. Contributing factors include lack of focus on intentional planning and lack of monitoring teacher lesson plans, teachers' limited understanding of the full intent of grade level standards, lack of pre-planned differentiated learning activities combined with pre-planned monitoring questions, and misalignment of daily activities to the full rigor of the standards.

**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.**

37% of students in our lowest quartile made a learning gain in math. This is 10% less than the state average of 47%. Our trend shows this component is historically one of the lowest for our school. We have a large population of ESE students and need to provide more support for teachers to fully understand the math standards and the standards of mathematical practice so they can scaffold support in a way that allows students to develop a true conceptual understanding of math concepts.

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

None of our components showed improvement. Our percentage of students showing ELA achievement remained the same at 66%. We strategically targeted the support of our literacy coach to work side-by-side with teachers to focus on conferring with readers and providing small group instruction through guided reading and strategy groups.

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

The large percentage of our students scoring levels 1 and 2 on the state assessment is alarming.  
 ELA - 37% of student not proficient  
 Math - 36% of students not proficient  
 Science - 36% of students not proficient

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

1. Intentional Planning and Backwards Design / Pre-planned differentiated small group instruction
2. Renewed focus on data
3. Student agency and engagement
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our first area of focus is Intentional Planning through Backward Design process. Teachers work in their Collaborative Learning Teams to plan standards based lessons that incorporate instructional strategies for both in-person and remote learners. Through the backward design process, CLTs work to develop pre-planned monitoring questions that lead to pre-planned differentiated small group lessons. Our school-wide goal is to differentiate as EARLY and OFTEN as possible with intentional plans for both enrichment and remediation. This is a natural evolution and the next layer of our school improvement goal from last year that focused on teacher efficacy, teamwork, and understanding the full rigor of the standards. Intentional planning is directly linked to student learning as it requires lessons to be aligned to the full expectations of the standards and differentiation to be embedded throughout daily lessons to scaffold and monitor student learning. Intentional planning was identified as a critical need by analyzing student performance results and uncovering misalignment of daily lessons.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Our goal is to increase ELA Achievement by one percentage point to 67% and to increase ELA Learning Gains by one percentage point to 57%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Our Guiding Coalition was established last year and will continue to move the work of intentional planning as they lead their Collaborative Learning Teams this year. We will continue to provide ongoing differentiated support for grade level teams and individual teachers throughout the school-year. Strategically focus on teacher efficacy and support each grade level as they work through the research based stages of teamwork: Forming, Norming, Storming, and Performing. Teams will expand on the clear vision and challenging goals set last year by layering in a focus on differentiation and small group instruction this year.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

When we are not achieving the results our students deserve, we must be genuinely reflective of our practice and clearly identify what we can do differently to achieve increased outcomes for our students. School leadership was very strategic in defining very clear, simplified goals and transparently sharing the plan and action steps with all stakeholders. Declining student proficiency and learning gains is a reflection of misalignment of daily instruction with the full rigor of the grade level standards. This misalignment can best be addressed through intentional planning and following the very specific steps of backwards design. Professional conversations with staff revealed a lack of teacher efficacy and a true need to focus on teamwork and collaboration. We worked diligently to lay a solid foundation last year and will continue layering in focus on pre-planned differentiated small group instruction this year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue our work to foster teacher efficacy through individualized meetings with members of our Guiding Coalition to empower each member with strategic action steps to best support their grade level CLT.
2. Continue to guard sacred times for CLTs to meet twice each week and expand the focus of these CLTs to include both intentional planning and analyzing student data to plan differentiated small group lessons.
3. Continue to communicate our clear school-wide focus and expectation of intentional planning. Provide release time for grade level teams to plan together with the support of district instructional coaches as needed.
4. Administrators give feedback on lesson plans throughout the year. Informally via email, post-it notes,



brief conversations and formally through observation post conferences and our Marzano evaluation tool.

5. Administrators are in classrooms daily observing alignment of lesson plans to instruction in the classroom. We celebrate success and praise efforts as we challenge the status quo and encourage all teachers to stretch beyond their comfort zone.

6. Strategic focus of classroom walk throughs to observe small group instruction with praise and feedback provided during each visit.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our focus on literacy instruction for students with disabilities is driven by student performance data revealing that this subgroup of students has a widening proficiency gap as compared to non-disabled peers. Student achievement data indicates our current instructional methods are not achieving the results our students deserve. Staying true to our school-wide focus on differentiation, our leadership team has worked to provide individualized targeted support to student in our lowest quartile.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our goal is for students in our lowest quartile to increase ELA Learning Gains by one percentage point to 49%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	With the support of our school leadership team, teachers, administrators, and support staff are planning and implementing targeted interventions for students in our lowest quartile.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We have shifted our core reading instruction for students in our self contained ESE classroom to include a systematic multi-sensory based literacy approach. In addition, we have layered in interventions individually designed to target specific learning gaps and skill deficits.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide on going professional development and support to our ESE teachers as they implement a new core reading curriculum in our self-contained ESE classrooms.
2. Leadership team will monitor implementation and provide feedback with the support of district ESE specialists.
3. Each member of the leadership team is assigned to support individual students in our lowest quartile. The principal, assistant principal, IPS coach, and school counselor will meet with assigned students bi-weekly to support and reinforce classroom instruction, provide additional conferring opportunities, set individualized student goals, consistently communicate with parents, and celebrate every incremental success.
4. Flexibly respond to student needs as they fluidly transition from remote to in-person learning. Flexibly adjust schedules as we monitor student progress and adapt instruction to meet individual student needs.

**Person Responsible** Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**This school year is filled with challenges and barriers never before imagined. Health and safety procedures and protocols are at the forefront of everything we do. Every logistical detail of the school day had to be restructured. We capitalized on the improvement we made last year with communication and have very transparently and consistently shared our revised procedures with all stakeholders. This has resulted in a community-wide understanding of health and safety policies and expectations with tremendous support and positivity from stakeholders.**

**Knowing this year we would often be short staffed due to illness or quarantine combined with the fact that substitute teachers are not readily available, we strategically designed our Related Arts teachers' schedules so they have 30 minutes of support time each afternoon. A calendar is planned each month for this support time which includes working with students in their classrooms, providing release time for grade level teachers to have additional planning time, facilitating school health and safety logistics, and providing enrichment lessons for students.**

**Our renewed focus on data and validated our resolution to develop flexible schedules based on student needs. In response to reflecting on our decrease in learning gains, we are dedicated to being flexible and implementing new strategies to meet the needs of students who are significantly above or below grade level. We are allowing teachers to have flexibility within their classroom schedules and have re-envisioned our intervention time to have more flexibility and fluidity in an effort to allow teachers to focus on needs of a greater number of students. We also strategically designed a mixed grade level 4/5 class comprised of high performing students in an effort to allow this teacher to more fully focus on enrichment and providing students' opportunities to push beyond the expectations of the grade level standards. This also decreases the range of differentiation required in our other 4th and 5th grade classes allowing these other teachers to more fully differentiate to support needs of our lowest quartile. We are creating schedules for outlier students that meet their individual needs. Designing student schedules in this way allows us to give students exactly what they need without being confined to the limitations of the grade level schedule. This innovative approach is already proving to have a positive impact on student agency and motivation and ensures we are not creating any further deficits by depriving students of the content specific instruction they need.**

**With our renewed focus on data, administrators are meeting with grade level CLTS to analyze the results of common assessments and plan differentiated student support based on the results. CLTs work to flexibly support students across classrooms to close the achievement gap for all students. We are incorporating data chats into teacher pre and post conferences as well as intentional planning sessions. We have set an expectation that teachers have goal setting conferences with students as they review assessment results. Administrators are modeling this process as we confer with students and visit classrooms as well.**

## **Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We continue our focus on school communication and celebrating success. We have implemented an official school Facebook page this year and proudly showcase the great work happening in our school each day. We strive to make at least two posts per day to keep stakeholders engaged. Our school Facebook page has evolved to a highly effective communication platform resulting in many community/business partnerships. Each classroom teacher also has a Remind account to send text messages to classroom families. We also continue our monthly newsletter and paper flyers to advertise school events. Additionally school administrators make automated calls with important reminders as needed.

We consistently and transparently share our school improvement goals with our staff, PTA, and SAC so that all stakeholders are very aware of our vision, mission and goals. We explicitly connect every school-wide initiative to our school improvement goals so stakeholders have a clear understanding of the cohesiveness of our action plan.

We also continue to support our teachers with Professional Development opportunities focused on strategies to engage both in-persona and remote learners this year. This new education platform has challenged us in new ways. The tremendous professional growth of our entire staff is commendable. Our leadership team is dedicated to supporting continued job-embedded PD throughout the school-year.

Finally, we continue with our goals of celebrating success of both students and staff. We work to meaningfully celebrate individual accomplishments as well as team successes.

#### 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: Differentiation				\$1,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1000	510-Supplies	0211 - Jensen Beach Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,800.00
			Notes: There are no new School Improvement funds this year. We will use our roll over funds from last year to purchase resources that specifically support our school improvement goal of intentionally planning differentiated small group lessons.			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$1,800.00