

Clay County Schools

Fleming Island Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Fleming Island Elementary School

4425 LAKESHORE DR, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fie.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Collins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Fleming Island Elementary School

4425 LAKESHORE DR, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fie.oneclay.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)
Elementary School PK-6	No	19%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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.

We will prepare our students to be independent life-long learners. We will provide a learning environment that is centered on our students, directed by our teachers, and supported by our homes and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fleming Island Elementary is a supportive and inclusive environment which engages and inspires students by promoting a growth mindset and belief that all students are capable of learning. We want our students to be problem solvers utilizing critical thinking skills to make a greater impact on the world.

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
Collins, Jennifer	Principal	Principal's job duties and responsibilities include overseeing the school's leadership team, serving as the instructional leader of the school, providing professional development to teachers based on needs and data, conducting data chats with students and teachers, observing and providing feedback to teachers, communicating with all stakeholders, maintaining the budget and other operational functions of the school.
Dover, Julie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal's job duties and responsibilities include serving on the leadership team, leading the PBIS team, providing instructional leadership, providing professional development to teachers based on needs and data, conducting data chats with students and teachers, observing and providing feedback to teachers, and communicating with all stakeholders.
Doane, Lana	Teacher, K-12	1st grade team leader
Johnson, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	6th grade team leader
Oswald, Melanie	Instructional Technology	Technology Teacher and Instructional Application Faciliator
Geiger, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	4th grade team leader
McCarthy, Karen	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher and grade level chair for ESE
Hale, Phyllis	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Team Leader
Vanley, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Luke, Jami	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Leader
Barnard, Robin	Teacher, K-12	5th grade team leader
Snyder, Leigh	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/3/2017, Jennifer Collins

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.*

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

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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

2

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	89	88	110	90	95	116	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	31	19	30	28	31	44	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	3	4	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	3	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	3	4	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

Wednesday 8/11/2021

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	84	99	83	82	100	94	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	84	99	83	82	100	94	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
Attendance below 90 percent	31	19	30	28	31	44	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	3	4	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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 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				82%	65%	57%	78%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	62%	58%	72%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	54%	53%	67%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				86%	70%	63%	82%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	66%	62%	82%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	56%	51%	74%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				85%	65%	53%	76%	66%	55%

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	80%	68%	12%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	64%	14%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	62%	28%	56%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2021					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	81%	71%	10%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	83%	69%	14%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	91%	64%	27%	60%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
06	2021					
	2019	88%	70%	18%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	82%	63%	19%	53%	29%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used I-Ready Reading and Math for all grade levels, K-6 as our progress monitoring tool.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	69	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	21	59	68
	English Language Learners	36	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	56	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	13	41	59
	English Language Learners	0	100	100
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	73	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	16	43	67
	English Language Learners	0	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	55	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	8	38	63
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76	87	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	MR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	30	60	48
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	72	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	0	45	58
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	60	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	28	32	50
	English Language Learners	50	50	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	60	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	16	27	48
	English Language Learners	100	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	63	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	22	26	31
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47	63	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	19	34	46
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	16	66	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	16	66	71
	English Language Learners	16	66	71
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	57	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	13	8	16
	English Language Learners	0	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47	62	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	17	34	37
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	49	50	32	67	62	41	50				
BLK	63			75							
HSP	76	69		84	53		79				
MUL	67			86							
WHT	81	73	42	87	82	50	72				
FRL	73	70		80	77	50	62				
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	55	53	50	64	65	60	60				
BLK	69			77							
HSP	80	46		67	69						
MUL	90	64		76	64						
WHT	81	70	65	89	83	76	88				
FRL	75	71	60	68	56	33	90				
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	48	49	59	56	60	66	54				
BLK	50	64		50	64						
HSP	81	82		72	82						
MUL	75	88		75	94						
WHT	80	71	70	85	82	76	75				
FRL	63	56	53	66	69	76	75				

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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	69
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	70
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	69
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The lowest 25% of students in all content areas are not making adequate gains when compared with all students. This is especially true in Reading and Math, and in the subgroup of students with disabilities.

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

Looking at FSA data as well as progress monitoring through I-Ready, it is evident that the lowest 25% of students, as well as Students with Disabilities have the greatest need of improvement in both Reading and Math. In addition, students in fifth grade showed a decrease in Science proficiency.

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

A lack of instructional materials and rigorous content to support the learning needs of students. New teachers to the grade level. Students learning online were part of the lowest 25%. Training to teachers, curriculum aligned to the standards, increased chats, and extra support for the lowest 25%

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

3rd grade Reading and Math showed the most improvement in FSA scores. Students in grades K-6 showed a large increase in Reading and Math according to the progress monitoring assessments. In addition, all tested grade levels were able to maintain an 86% proficiency level in Math.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were an increased focus in the primary grades on phonics and a consistent, standards-based Math curriculum. The Math curriculum in 3-6 used was also standards-based and built upon the foundation that was established in the primary grades.

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

Students will be provided an intervention block of time in ELA and Math where students will utilize evidenced based materials. A new curriculum with evidence based Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in reading will be utilized with students in the lowest 25%. Use of Lexia (Reading) and Penda (Science) will help students on the foundational skills in these subject areas.

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 engage in training opportunities on Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, SAVVAS reading curriculum, working with students in the lowest 25%, and new BEST standards in Reading. In addition, teachers will receive training on Lexia, a new program to support students receiving interventions.

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

We will use ESSIR funds to provide tutoring supports to those students who may be struggling in reading and math. We will also have a before school computer lab to address those students who need extra reading time on Lexia. We will also meet every three weeks as an intervention team to determine supports that are needed for tier 2 and 3 students in both Reading and Math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

The area of focus will be on ensuring that the identified students in the lowest 25% make gains in Reading.

Over the past five years, the gains in the lowest 25% in reading have significantly decreased. In 2017, the percent of students in the lowest 25% making gains in reading was 73%. It has decreased significantly each year, from 67% in 2018, 63% in 2019, and now 45% in 2021. This area is important because it addresses the needs of one of our most fragile groups, students who have been identified as part of the lowest quartile, according to the 2020-2021 data.

Measurable Outcome:

In the 2021-2022 school year, our learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase by 20%. 65% of students in the lowest 25% in reading will make gains in reading.

Monitoring:

The Principal and Assistant Principal will track data of students in the lowest 25% in reading throughout the year. Through profile sheets, data analysis, and teacher/student data chats, the administration will ensure that the lowest 25% in reading are making progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will utilize standards-based, evidence based differentiated activities through small groups to provide remediation and/or enrichment to address student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If teachers utilize evidence based activities and lessons that are aligned to the BEST standards and are based on student data and needs, then students will receive instruction that is differentiated and at their level, and will help students in the lowest 25% make gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% in reading.

Person Responsible

Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will participate in professional development related to the new curriculum, BEST standards for ELA, and Lexia.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will include time in the daily schedule for a remediation/enrichment block in which teachers will utilize these activities.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will utilize Lexia with identified students, including the lowest 25% in the remediation/enrichment block and small groups.

Person Responsible

Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Leadership team will monitor the progress of students in the lowest 25% in Reading through student and teacher data chats, as well as profile sheets.

Person Responsible Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus will be on ensuring that identified students in the lowest 25% make gains in Math. Over the past five years, the gains in the lowest 25% in reading have significantly decreased. In 2018, the percent of students in the lowest 25% making gains in math was 74%. It has decreased significantly each year, from 69% in 2019 and now 52% in 2021. This area is important because it addresses the needs of one of our most fragile groups, students who have been identified as part of the lowest quartile, according to the 2020-2021 data.

Measurable Outcome: In the 2021-2022 school year, our learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase by 18%. 70% of students in the lowest 25% in Math will make gains in the area of Math.

Monitoring: The Principal and Assistant Principal will track data of students in the lowest 25% in math throughout the year. Through profile sheets, data analysis, and teacher/student data chats, the administration will ensure that the lowest 25% in math are making progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize small group, differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Administrators will meet with teachers quarterly to analyze data and plan for instruction to meet the needs of struggling students. Students will track their own data and create goals for growth in areas of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By providing differentiated instruction, students are met where they are and are able to fill learning gaps. Research shows that presenting teachers with data on their students results in learning gains and students tracking their own data results in even more gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% in Math.

Person Responsible Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will have daily small groups in Math that are differentiated based on students' needs.

Person Responsible Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

Students will utilize I-Ready that addresses their Math strengths and weaknesses.

Person Responsible Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will utilize the Teacher Toolbox in Math to provide enrichment and/or remediation as needed.

Person Responsible Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Each year, the school district provides students with a climate survey. This survey looks at student feedback in areas such as social awareness, relationship skills, responsible decision making, and self-management. During this past school year's survey, 41% of K-2 students and 29.6% of 3-6 students strongly agreed that they have positive peer relations. In addition, 55.7% of K-2 students and 36.2% of 3-6 students felt they received positive recognition from adults.
Measurable Outcome:	70% of students in grades K-6 will strongly agree that there are positive peer relations and positive recognition from adults as measured by the student climate survey administered by the school district.
Monitoring:	Monthly PBIS meetings will be held to monitor the implementation and evaluation of the goal and strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of the 7 Mindsets curriculum as well as PBIS strategies will help improve both peer relations among students and positive recognition from adults.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These curriculum and strategies are evidence based and shown to help make improvements in these areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will utilize the 7 Mindsets curriculum in their classrooms.

Person Responsible Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Staff will use a positive referral in order to recognize students for one of the 7 mindsets.

Person Responsible Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

The Stingray Way pledge will be modified and utilized daily to emphasize kindness, respectful, responsible, and safe.

Person Responsible Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Monthly Standout Stingray awards will be given to students who are following the monthly mindset.

Person Responsible Jennifer Collins (jennifer.collins@myoneclay.net)

School-wide expectations will be established and utilized for common areas such as the cafeteria, hallways, playground, and restrooms.

Person Responsible Julie Dover (julie.dover@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The school discipline data is less than the discipline data of the state. The school data falls into the very low category compared to all other elementary schools in the state. The area of concern that the school will monitor is physical altercations between students. The PBIS team will analyze discipline data monthly and revise the pbis plan as needed.

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.

Fleming Island Elementary strives to build a positive school culture and environment in several ways and by engaging many stakeholders. Students are provided social emotional learning by using the 7 Mindsets curriculum. 7 Mindsets teaches and engages students in success strategies which enable them to live the life of their dreams. Alongside social emotional learning, Fleming Island Elementary utilizes a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) model in order to take a positive, proactive approach to behavior. Common, school-wide expectations and guidelines for success are established, posted, taught and revisited throughout the school year. Students are recognized often for positive behavior as well as academic growth. Students, teachers and staff are celebrated for their successes and accomplishments via social media and staff newsletters.

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

Fleming Island Elementary solicited input from various stakeholders including, but not limited to, teachers, staff, students, parents, business partners and community members to develop a vision statement to guide the everyday working of the school. The 7 Mindsets are promoted via social media and newsletters to both family and community members so that these stakeholders can partner with our students and staff to support positive thinking and happiness. The Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) team meets monthly to develop plans of engaging the school and community in activities to promote positive culture and environment as well as analyzing discipline data to determine the need of increasing, decreasing or changing positive interventions and supports school wide. Administrators select weekly "employees of the week" for both support and instructional staff. Pictures are taken in classrooms and put in the weekly newsletter by administrators to celebrate the work being done in the building. Community business partners provide incentives for teachers and students for meeting goals. FIE has a Military and

Family Life Counselor on campus daily who holds lunch bunches, deployment groups, and yellow ribbon ceremonies for our military connected students. The Parent Faculty Association (PFA) provides lunch, celebrations, dances, food trucks, etc. for students, staff, and community members. Additionally, the PFA designs and sells a school tshirt for students, staff, parents and more to wear to school and in the community to promote the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00