

Jefferson County School District

Jefferson Schools K 12



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Jefferson Schools K 12

50 DAVID RD, Monticello, FL 32344

www.jeffersonschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Jackie Pons

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2020-21 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Jefferson 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	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Jefferson Schools K 12

50 DAVID RD, Monticello, FL 32344

www.jeffersonschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		D	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Jefferson 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.

Jefferson County K-12: A Somerset School promotes a culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed learners in a safe and enriching environment to support future life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jefferson County K-12: A Somerset School will be the first diverse rural school system to work with families and the community to successfully educate all of its students at high levels

All students will learn Tiger PRIDE: Persistence, Responsibility, Independence, Dedication, and Excellence.

Tiger Pledge

- A Somerset Tiger will not disrupt, nor allow anyone else to disrupt the sanctity of our learning environment
- A Somerset Tiger will not demean or disrespect the self nor another Tiger by words, actions, or technology.
- A Somerset Tiger is strong, courageous and even in failure has the heart to still win.
- A Somerset Tiger is intelligent, dedicated, and always learning.
- A Somerset Tiger will not lower the self to a standard lesser greatness.

Somerset Tiger teachers, administrators, parents, and the community share the responsibility for advancing the school's mission so all Tigers will achieve.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Oliver, Cory	Principal	
Gainey, Andre	Assistant Principal	
Barany, Shirrie	Other	
	Other	
Pons, John	Administrative Support	
Rivera, Maribel	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Roddenberry, Nicole	Reading Coach	
West, Rowena	Math Coach	
Wilcoxson, Raven	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/14/2017, Jackie Pons

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Total number of students enrolled at the school

356

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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	54	49	76	56	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346	
Attendance below 90 percent	24	24	30	26	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	
One or more suspensions	3	2	6	7	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	
Course failure in ELA	13	11	8	12	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	
Course failure in Math	11	4	13	13	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	27	27	19	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	

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	13	9	13	19	4	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	9	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/14/2021

2020-21 - 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	55	74	60	47	59	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	371
Attendance below 90 percent	17	23	34	12	13	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	11	10	21	9	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA	5	5	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	7	2	7	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	11	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	14	5	22	12	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	9	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - 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	55	74	60	47	59	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	371
Attendance below 90 percent	17	23	34	12	13	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	11	10	21	9	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA	5	5	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	7	2	7	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	11	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	14	5	22	12	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	9	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				36%		61%	38%		60%
ELA Learning Gains				37%		59%	43%		57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%		54%	43%		52%
Math Achievement				49%		62%	46%		61%
Math Learning Gains				45%		59%	50%		58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%		52%	41%		52%
Science Achievement				27%		56%	29%		57%
Social Studies Achievement						78%			77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	45%	45%	0%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	32%	0%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	26%	26%	0%	56%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	35%	0%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	24%	24%	0%	53%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Kindergarten: iReady Data collection

1st grade: iReady (ELA and Math)

2nd grade: iReady (ELA and Math)

3rd grade: iReady (ELA and Math)

4th grade: iReady (ELA and Math)

5th grade: iReady (ELA and Math), District Science Tool

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	9	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	9	21
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	1
	English Language Learners	2	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	9	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	9	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	0
	English Language Learners	2	2	0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	9	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	9	12
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	10	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	10	17
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	0
	English Language Learners	2	1	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	30	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	30	36
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	0
	English Language Learners	0	1	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	16	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	16	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	0
	English Language Learners	0	2	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10	16	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	16	20
	Students With Disabilities	2	2	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	15	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	15	19
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	11	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	11	17
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	19	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	19	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10	12	13
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	12	13
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	15		14							
ELL	29			31							
BLK	29	19		31	5	20					
HSP	35			19							
WHT	44	46		54	50		29				
FRL	31	32	45	33	15	18	9				
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	15	38	64	17	33	43					
ELL											
BLK	29	33	48	46	42	26	24				
HSP	50	50		56	50						

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
WHT	51	36		56	52						
FRL	35	30	48	48	41	29	18				
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	13	58	60	24	45	45					
ELL	25			33							
BLK	33	41	43	43	46	33	23				
HSP	39	36		52	64						
WHT	63	65		56	65						
FRL	38	45	44	46	51	44	24				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	234
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	9
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on 2020 - 2021 progress monitoring, grade levels 1, 3, 4, 5 proficient in ELA increased by a minimum of 10% over the course of the year.

Based on 2020 - 2021 progress monitoring, the number of students, in each grade level proficient in Mathematics increased by a minimum of 8 students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The grade 5 FSA ELA students from the school year 2018-2019 under performed compared to their same grade comparison and cohort comparison. There was a 5% drop in proficiency level in the same grade comparison and a 21% drop in cohort comparison. In grade level data progress monitoring assessment from the 2020 - 2021 school year, the number of students proficient in grade 5 ELA increased by 8.

The grade 5 FSA Mathematics students scores from the school year 2018-2019 under performed compared to their same grade comparison and cohort comparison. There was a 5% drop in proficiency level in the same grade comparison and a 19% drop in cohort comparison. In grade level data progress monitoring assessment from the 2020-2021 school year, the number of students proficient in grade 5 Mathematics increased by 13.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factor to this need for improvement is the achievement gap that has increased due to Covid19. The new actions that would need to be taken are small group interventions and an intervention program to assist with student learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The grade 3 Mathematics proficiency level was 52%. Based on 2020-2021 progress monitoring assessment data, the number of students proficient in grade 3 Mathematics increased by 25 over the course of the year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement are the I-Ready Mathematics intervention program and fluid pull out intervention groups.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategy that will be implemented to accelerate learning is SRA Reading Mastery by McGraw Hill. This is a direct instruction program designed to provide explicit, systematic instruction in English language reading for grade K-6. Additionally, the I-Ready ELA intervention program will be implemented daily, push in support for students with disabilities and pull out intervention groups.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers and leaders will be provided the opportunity for I-Ready and SRA professional development trainings. They will also have the support and guidance of two academic coaches.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The continuation of progress monitoring, assessment data collection and academic coach assistance will ensure the sustainability of improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Following the review of the ESSA subgroup data, the African American students earned 35% of the Federal Index. This is one of the two lowest performing subgroups in the school. The RTI/MTSS process has identified a growing number of students with this subgroup that are below grade level in ELA or Mathematics or both areas.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year the Federal Index will increase from 35% for the African American subgroup to 41%
Monitoring:	This will be monitored with the use of the RTI/MTSS process, identifying tier groups, creating intervention groups and implementing explicit curriculum. Additionally, tracking and remediating student conduct using a behavior management system (PBIS).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is a systems approach to establishing the social culture and behavioral supports needed for all children in a school to achieve both social and academic success. PBIS is not a packaged curriculum, but an approach that defines core elements that can be achieved through a variety of strategies. The core elements of PBIS are integrated within organizational systems in which teams, working with administrators and behavior specialists, provide the training, policy support and organizational supports needed for (a) initial implementation, (b) active application, and (c) sustained use of the core elements (Sugai & Horner, 2010).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS character education program will be implemented to decrease out-of-school and in-school suspensions, boost self-regulated behaviors, and empower students to maximize their learning opportunities. Literacy Coach hired to support K-12 students, modeling best-practice teaching strategies, data driven classrooms, and targeted lesson planning. School-Wide PBIS program to reduce the number of suspensions and increase the amount of time that students are engaged in education.

Action Steps to Implement

The PBIS team includes the Principal, Cory Oliver, Vice Principal, Andre Gainey, Assistant Principal Courtney Oliver, ESE Director, Shirrie Barany, Social Worker, Luke Brocco, Guidance Denise Robinson, Dean of Discipline Rodell Thomas, Literacy Coach Nicole Roddenberry, Activity Director, Nancy Whitty, Strategic Initiatives Coach Allyn Howard, and Curriculum Director John Pons . The school-based PBIS team will review all student progress monitoring data, discipline data, and attendance data to identify the high-risk student subgroup.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The PBIS team will create a calendar of monthly activities and checkpoints for instructional staff to implement and attend.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

During the pre-planning week the PBIS team will train the teachers in the RtI/MTSS new protocol and character education strategies.

Person Responsible Shirrie Barany (sbarany@somersetjefferson.org)

During the 2021 - 2022 school year, the PBIS team will analyze data collected monthly related to the subgroup. Additional action steps will be created depending on the data analysis.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Following the review of the ESSA subgroup data, the students with disabilities earned 35% of the Federal Index. This is one of the two lowest performing subgroups in the school. The RTI/MTSS process has identified a growing number of student with this subgroup that are below grade level in ELA or Mathematics or both areas.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2021-2022 school year the performance of students with disabilities will increase from 35% of the Federal Index to 41% of the Federal Index.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by the use targeted instruction and assessment, collaborative teacher planning and small group interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shirrie Barany (sbarany@somersetjefferson.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI), an approach to learning based on the best research available, helps teachers deliver effective lessons that can significantly improve achievement for all learners, including English language learners and students with special needs.</p> <p>MTSS Tier 2/3 students receive targeted interventions and support outlined in the Research-based Reading Plan. The Literacy Coach and Director of ESE work closely together to monitor student academic Tier status. Any students identified as performing one or two years below grade level receive push-in and pull-out intervention support by the Intervention teacher or ESE resource teacher.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI), allows teachers at all grade levels can deliver solid instruction by implementing the components of EDI: Checking for understanding; setting lesson objectives; activating prior knowledge; developing students' skills by explaining, modeling, and demonstrating; presenting content; using guided practice.</p> <p>MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Support) - To ensure efficient use of resources, schools begin with the identification of trends and patterns using school-wide and grade-level data. Students who need instructional intervention beyond what is provided universally for positive behavior or academic content areas are provided with targets, supplemental interventions delivered individually or in small groups at increasing levels of intensity. The MTSS is characterized by a continuum of integrated academic and behavior supports reflecting the need for students to have fluid access to instruction and supports of varying intensity levels. (www.florida-rti.org)</p>

Action Steps to Implement

The MTSS team includes school administration, Literacy Coach, Social Worker, Guidance Counselor, and Dean of Discipline. meeting to review performance of all SWD students and analyze any trends or issues that are apparent. The school Leadership Team will meet over the summer to align the priorities of MTSS and PBIS plans for the upcoming 2021-22 school year including monthly focus calendars, character highlight celebrations, quarterly checkpoints, and instructional materials for all grade levels.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implementation of Instructional Focus Calendars for all grade levels and subject areas will be utilized for targeted instruction and assessment.

Person Responsible Shirrie Barany (sbarany@somersetjefferson.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Jefferson Somerset Elementary school earned 40% of the possible school grade points for the 2018-2019 school year. Areas of weakness include performance by the Low 25% of students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year 50% of students in the Low-25% category will earn a learning-gain on the FSA ELA test. By the end of the 2021-2022 school year 45% of students in the Low-25% category will earn a learning-gain on the FSA Mathematics test.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by iReady diagnostics and monthly standards mastery assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Development targeted towards: Standards based instruction. Standards based instruction helps guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning. The use of standards to streamline instruction ensures that teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets. Expectations for student learning are mapped out with each prescribed standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The successful implementation of standards-based education practices compels educators to embrace a continuous improvement cycle that focuses on effective teaching and learning practices through planning, doing, reflecting, and revising.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.What do students need to know, understand, and be able to do? (Plan) 2. How do we teach effectively to ensure students are learning? (Do) 3. How do we know students are learning? (Reflect) 4.What do we do when students are not learning or are reaching mastery before expectation? (Revise)

Action Steps to Implement

During the pre-planning week teachers will attend professional development sessions on Standards-based instruction and implementation.

Person Responsible Andre Gainey (againey@somersetjefferson.org)

Grade-Level and Department Level meetings are scheduled monthly to discuss standards-based instruction for the upcoming week/month. Instructional calendars are developed to target the instructional standards and pace of instructional delivery.

Person Responsible Shirrie Barany (sbarany@somersetjefferson.org)

Bi-monthly core subject area assessments are administered to determine the effectiveness of the instruction and areas of weakness.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

K-2 SAT-10 Data and 3-5 FSA ELA Data reflect an area of concern. Currently, 29% of students assessed annual on the SAT-10 assessment fall above the 25th percentile on ELA performance. Currently, 36% of students assessed annually on the FSA Reading assessment fall above a Level 3.

Measurable Outcome:

The School's literacy coach will attend weekly department meetings to provide feedback and strategies for improved practice. Teachers in need of modeling and support will be provided with opportunities to observe and work with mentor teachers in model classrooms. All ELA instructors have common planning and will meet weekly with district reading coach for coaching, planning, and support.

Jefferson County will increase the percentage of students currently scoring at or above grade level on the SAT-10 by 11 points, from an average percentile of 29 (2018-2019) to 40 (2021-2022). Jefferson County will increase the percentage of students currently scoring Level 3 or higher from 36% (2018-19) to 42% (2021-22).

Monitoring:

Documentation and summary emails will be sent to administration, teacher with common planning groups, and additional support staff. The coach keeps a binder with all logs that provide the times and instructional practices that take place daily. Lesson plans will reflect the common planning instructional design and practice elements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Roddenberry (nroddenberry@somersetjefferson.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Instructional Coaching Model: Based on the results of the data, the team determines the effectiveness of the instruction and interventions. If data is not meeting projected targets, the team conducts a needs assessment to revise common planning instructional targets and determines what, if any, training opportunities may be needed to support the school's literacy goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Instructional Coaching Model with common planning: Instructional coaches are able to move through the impact cycle with instructional staff and build a partnership to accomplish school-wide goals. 1. Identify current instructional strategies. 2. Set classroom goals. 3. Model instructional strategies. 4 Identify areas of strength and areas of weakness in instructional lesson planning. 5. Target instructional practices that will increase student achievement. 6. Create a tiered support platform for instructional staff

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule common planning time for all ELA sections 3-10. Structure the common planning time by dissecting the standard, identifying instructional practices, and outline a weekly schedule of events.

Person Responsible

Nicole Roddenberry (nroddenberry@somersetjefferson.org)

Assess implementation of the common planning strategies. Walk-through data will be collected weekly by administration, academic coaches, and support staff to monitor for implementation. Data collection excel document shared by all parties.

Person Responsible

Cory Oliver (coliver@somersetjefferson.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Student performance in science has been an area of critical need since the 2015-2016 school year in Jefferson County. Past proficiency levels include 17% (2015-16), 31% (2016-17), 29% (2017-18), and 27% (2018-19).
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Jefferson Elementary will increase student proficiency on the Grade 5 SSA from 27% Level 3 or higher (2018-19) to 42% (2021-22). This will be achieved by creating a common team planning time for Grade 5 science teachers, a targeted instructional focus calendar, strategic hands-on activities, and curriculum planning.
Monitoring:	Academic coaches will conduct common team planning specifically for Grade 5 science standards that are annually assessed each week. The instructional design and instructional practices will be recorded and summarized via email to the entire administrative team, teachers, and academic support staff. Informal walk-through data will be collected weekly to monitor for implementation of the common planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rowena West (rwest@somersetjefferson.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Coaching Model: Based on the results of the data, the team determines the effectiveness of the instruction and interventions. If data is not meeting projected targets, the team conducts a needs assessment to revise common planning instructional targets and determines what, if any, training opportunities may be needed to support the school's science goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Coaching Model with common planning: Instructional coaches are able to move through the impact cycle with instructional staff and build a partnership to accomplish school-wide goals. 1. Identify current instructional strategies. 2. Set classroom goals. 3. Model instructional strategies. 4 Identify areas of strength and areas of weakness in instructional lesson planning. 5. Target instructional practices that will increase student achievement. 6. Create a tiered support platform for instructional staff

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule Common Planning, Instructional Focus Calendar, and classroom expectations.

Person Responsible Rowena West (rwest@somersetjefferson.org)

Analyze student progress monitoring data for instructional effectiveness.

Person Responsible Cory Oliver (coliver@somersetjefferson.org)

Collect classroom walkthrough data to monitor implementation of common planning instructional design and instructional practices.

Person Responsible Cory Oliver (coliver@somersetjefferson.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

According to FL School Safety dashboard, Jefferson Elementary is ranked "very high" compared to the state average for critical incidents. This ranking is much higher than the state average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Acquiring a Dean of Discipline and creating a multidisciplinary unit focused on PBIS was essential to maintaining a positive learning environment for all students. The Dean of Discipline is trained in CPI and additional deescalation methods. The other members of the unit include a full-time social worker, behavioral specialist, additional interim assistant principal, community wellness partners; Apalachee Center, CCYS, Disk Village, Canopy Wellness, PAEC.

Jefferson Elementary ranks "very high" in incidents that are violent including; threat or intimidation, physical attacks, and sexual offences. A school-wide SEL program has been adopted and SEL is included in the special area rotation for all students K-5. Students receive 60 minutes of SEL instruction during this special area rotation.

Jefferson Elementary ranks "very high" drug or public order incidents including weapon possession. Security contract with DSI is acquired to assist in the monitoring of student behavior and to assist administration and SROs in response to critical incidents on campus.

Measurable Outcome:

Jefferson Elementary will reduce the amount of discipline referrals related to threat/intimidation, fighting, or sexual incident by 10% compared to the 2019-2020 school discipline data reports.

Monitoring:

Student service team will meet monthly to review students MTSS and Discipline data. Discipline referrals will be monitored for location, time, and reporting party to identify areas of support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andre Gainey (againey@somersetjefferson.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Positive Behavior Interventions and Support will be implemented by a school based PBIS team in partnership with the Florida PBIS Project. This PBIS system will include analyzing the system of support for students including PBIS, Mental Health, and Academics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

PBIS is a problem-solving process that is proactive instead of reactive, allows for teachers to focus on positive actions in the classroom, identifies variables that are not helping student achieve academically or behaviorally, allows staff to apply targeted support for students at all levels in the school.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop multidisciplinary student support unit. Including a full time Dean of Discipline, Social Worker, Behavioral technician, Community Wellness Partners.

Person Responsible

Shirrie Barany (sbarany@somersetjefferson.org)

Schedule monthly data meetings to review all student discipline data and engage the problem solving team.

Person Responsible

Shirrie Barany (sbarany@somersetjefferson.org)

Provide training and support for staff in the areas of trauma informed care, conscious discipline, Kagan instructional strategies, deescalation exercises, and SEL curriculum.

Person Responsible Shirrie Barany (sbarany@somersetjefferson.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to FL School Safety Dashboard. Jefferson Elementary School ranks "very high" reporting 2.8 incidents per 100 students. This ranking is much higher than the state average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Acquiring a Dean of Discipline and creating a multidisciplinary unit focused on PBIS was essential to maintaining a positive learning environment for all students. The Dean of Discipline is trained in CPI and additional deescalation methods. The other members of the unit include a full-time social worker, behavioral specialist, additional interim assistant principal, community wellness partners; Apalachee Center, CCYS, Disk Village, Canopy Wellness, PAEC.

Jefferson Elementary ranks "very high" in incidents that are violent including; threat or intimidation, physical attacks, and sexual offenses. A school-wide SEL program has been adopted and SEL is included in the special area rotation for all students K-5. Students receive 60 minutes of SEL instruction during this special area rotation.

Jefferson Elementary ranks "very high" drug or public order incidents including weapon possession. Security contract with DSI is acquired to assist in the monitoring of student behavior and to assist administration and SROs in response to critical incidents on campus.

Jefferson Elementary provides school-wide professional development including trauma informed care, conscious discipline, win-win discipline, and CHAMPS.

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.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a combination of administrators, faculty, staff, parents, and community leaders that assist a school with determining how to best address needs specific to that school's learning community.

Jefferson Somerset has one School Advisory Council that meets regularly to fulfill the responsibilities of law and policy. The SAC is a balanced group composed of the principal, teachers, parents, support staff, and students (required at high school, adult and vocational levels), business persons and other community representatives that participate in the decision-making process at the school level.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Jefferson County stakeholders include school administration, teachers, parents, community leaders, support staff, and students. The stakeholders will build and maintain positive relationships to make the school a conducive teaching and learning environment. They plan and implement activities or projects for the benefit of the learners and school. Additionally, stakeholders are responsible for the achievement of learning outcomes through their active participation in school activities, programs, and projects.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00