

Clay County Schools

Doctors Inlet 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	23

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Carolyn Ayers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	66%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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	23

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://dis.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	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	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.

Doctors Inlet Elementary School's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, rigorous, engaging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing learning opportunities that are relevant to the real world and transcend the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Doctors Inlet Elementary school exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring life skills.

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
Ayers, Carolyn	Principal	This team meets monthly to discuss the ongoings of Doctors Inlet Elementary. They represent each of the teams at DIS. They provide input, help to vote, and disseminate information to teachers. This team also helps to facilitate and lead Professional Learning Communities and report to administration with Professional Development needs for faculty.
Farber, Jocelyn	Assistant Principal	
Long, Hannah	Teacher, K-12	
Wellons, Techla	Teacher, K-12	
Bohn, Laura	Teacher, ESE	
Harrison, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	
Raley, Montgomery	Teacher, K-12	
Lang, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Senters, April	School Counselor	
Hanlin, Anita	Teacher, ESE	
Saucier, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	
Haynes, Michelle		
Guess, Carli	Teacher, K-12	
Stutz, Anissa	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Carolyn Ayers

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

609

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	92	72	64	82	75	95	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	35	19	24	20	20	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	26	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/19/2021

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	67	59	66	73	89	84	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	9	1	15	16	15	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	6	0	0	22	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	5	0	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	5	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	67	59	66	73	89	84	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	9	1	15	16	15	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	6	0	0	22	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	5	0	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	2	5	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				63%	65%	57%	67%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	62%	58%	63%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	54%	53%	44%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	70%	63%	70%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	66%	62%	65%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	56%	51%	55%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	65%	53%	67%	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	61%	68%	-7%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	62%	-5%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2021					
	2019	76%	64%	12%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	71%	2%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	64%	6%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
06	2021					
	2019	74%	70%	4%	55%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	63%	-8%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used to compile the data below will be iReady Math and Reading for grades 1-6.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	66	85
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	57	88
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	41	91
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8	37	66
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	63	74
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	40	57
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	54	58
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	51	67
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	55	54
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	57	81
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	61	62
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	58	69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			

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	40	49	40	44	59	38	52				
ELL	36			43							
BLK	55	69		45	62						
HSP	55	71		61	71						
MUL	44	30		50	60						
WHT	68	67	54	69	63	40	72				
FRL	54	60	65	52	52	50	52				
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	39	57	63	65	76	47	41				
ELL	53	42		63	77						
ASN	90			100							
BLK	47	56	54	51	59	38	31				
HSP	57	70		67	50						
MUL	50	36		61	64						
WHT	67	63	57	76	73	64	63				
FRL	50	52	55	70	73	61	40				
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	45	51	38	53	59	46	43				
ELL	54			38							
ASN	100			90							
BLK	55	66	50	61	53	58	45				
HSP	49	64	60	63	72		67				
MUL	50	40		55	47						
WHT	72	63	40	74	67	57	70				
FRL	63	61	45	69	64	59	60				

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	61
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	73

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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	68
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	46

Multiracial Students	
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 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	62
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	55
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?

Fifth grade saw increases in proficiency in all subject areas. All other grade levels decreased in proficiency for math and 2 other grade levels (3rd and 6th) decreased in ELA.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in 3rd and 4th grade math. 6th grade ELA also is an area of need for improvement.

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

Some contributing factors to this need for improvement include online learning difficulties. This was also the first time fourth grade took standardized tests (which included writing), therefore they were not able to look at gains from the previous year. Other contributing factors were faculty changes including OCO (OneClay Online) & long-term substitutes. We also had made intentional placement of our assistants into reading classrooms. While this was beneficial, we saw a decrease in math scores (we had previously used assistants in math as well).

Consistency in brick-and-mortar learning will address this need for improvement. By the majority of

students being back on campus, we can provide a more rigorous learning environment as well as more accountability measures. Implementation of the B.E.S.T standards and piloting the IXL Math program will also help to increase student achievement. Implementation of PENDA for science, new ELA curriculum, and using assistants in some of our math classrooms will help increase our scores as well.

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

Fifth grade showed proficiency growth in all subject areas. There was 11 points growth in ELA, 8 points growth in Math, and 9 points growth in science.

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

For science, we used Achieve 3000 content-based articles/text for science reinforcement, labs, integrating of science into other content areas, and reinforcement of science into resource classes. ELA increased with heavy ESE support, assistants in the classroom, and rigorous tasks. The math increase can be attributed to use of Eureka with fidelity, iReady instructional pathway use, and small group instruction.

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

We will continue to provide rigorous interdisciplinary texts in science (and all subject areas). We will also continue to provide opportunities for students to develop their skills outside of the classroom via clubs and other after-school activities. We will use assistants to support learning in the classroom and ensure ESE teachers are available to push in to support students.

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.

Professional development opportunities include collaborative, data-driven PLCs where teachers are working to meet student needs while still providing enrichment in areas of strength. Instructional personnel will also be provided with optional professional development to meet specific instructional needs such as: creating student-centered classrooms, remaining equitable in Exceptional Education, and other instructional strategies.

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

Additional services include tutoring for students that are having difficulties in ELA, math, and science. Students will also use Lexia Core 5 and Lexia PowerUp to receive intervention services.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social-Emotional Learning can have a great impact on student achievement, student discipline, and student self-control. When we strive to set goals, take responsibility, and problem-solve with students they excel emotionally and in turn academically. Based on the EWS indicators, attendance is an area of concern....

Measurable Outcome: We will boost student attendance from the current percentage () to 10% of students in grade K-6 having less than 90% attendance.

Monitoring: Students will be monitored through teacher clipboards as well as Synergy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 7 mindsets lesson will be implemented this year to increase student responsibility and positivity on campus. Teachers will submit positive student notes to be sent home to encourage students to keep showing responsibility and ownership for their learning. The guidance counselor will continue to provide SEL lessons in 30-minute increments in the classrooms to present and discuss specific topics related to each grade level and student needs. PBIS strategies are used to encourage positive behavior, including a cool-down room where students can speak with an adult to reflect on their choices and the consequences of their choices and rejoin their class after their reflection period.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS strategies are chosen for this area of focus to boost student morale and confidence thus increasing student attendance. When school is a safe and positive place to be, students will want to do everything they can to make it here.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of 7 mindsets (lessons, monthly student recognition via assembly, phone calls home, postcards home, etc).

Person Responsible Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Monthly SEL lessons in each classroom specific to student grade-level and classroom needs.

Person Responsible April Senters (april.senters@myoneclay.net)

Set and celebrate goals with students.

Person Responsible Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Third grade math FSA proficiency was 52% (down from 73% in 2019). Fourth grade FSA math proficiency was 59% (down from 72% in 2019). These drops can be contributed to several factors, including 2 brand new teachers, 2 teachers who had long term subs for 2 months each, 1 teacher having OCO students, and the fact that all of these students were taking FSA for the first time. We were also unable to show learning gains for 4th grade.

Measurable Outcome: Based on this years data, our goal is for 3rd grade math to increase by 10%, from 52% to 62% proficiency and for 4th grade math to increase by 5%, from 59% to 64% proficiency.

Monitoring: We will use math iReady diagnostic data, classroom observations and assessments, and iXL data to monitor progress throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: For the last 2 years, we have focused our assistants in our ELA classes. We are going to intentionally plan to utilize assistants in 3rd and 4th grade math classes. We are also using resource teachers to push in and assist in their intervention blocks. We have placed teachers based on their strengths. Through the use of small groups, MTSS, remediation, and standards based instruction using iXL and Eureka, we expect these scores to increase.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have chosen the strategy of standards based instruction and focusing on small groups because we have seen the impact that small groups make. Last year, during COVID, small groups were more difficult with social distancing. We fully expect our numbers to bounce back with these strategies in place.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide support to teachers about curriculum guide, gap lessons, and standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

Monitor iXL, classroom, and iReady data through data meetings.

Person Responsible Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Provide support to teachers to facilitate small group instruction through the use of assistants, ESE, and resource teachers.

Person Responsible Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 6th grade ELA FSA proficiency was 62% (down from 76% in 2019). Since learning gains were 67% and bottom quartile learning gains were 43%, we know some things were working. However, we will be intentionally working to increase proficiency. We had an OCO position in 6th grade and had to make some changes mid year, resulting in multiple classes having a change in teacher.

Measurable Outcome: Based on this year's data, our goal is for 6th grade proficiency to increase by 5% to 67% or higher.

Monitoring: We will use Achieve300, Lexia, and SAVAAS assessments to monitor progress throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We have planned with Florida Inclusion Network to best support our ESE students by having an ESE teacher support 6th grade most of the day. The 6th grade team of teachers is strong and is working together, collaborating to integrate subject areas, and use data to fill instructional gaps. Through the use of small groups, MTSS, remediation, and standards based instruction using SAVAAS with fidelity, we expect these scores to increase.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have chosen the strategy of standards based instruction and focusing on small groups because we have seen the impact that small groups make. Last year, during COVID, small groups were more difficult with social distancing. We fully expect our numbers to bounce back with these strategies in place, especially with the strategic planning of ESE inclusion support and data based collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide support to teachers about standards based planning using the new standards and curriculum.

Person Responsible Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

Monitor Achieve3000, classroom, and Lexia data through data meetings.

Person Responsible Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Provide support to teachers to facilitate small group instruction through the use of ESE support and intentional planning.

Person Responsible Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@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.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, across all Elementary schools in the state of Florida there were 1,467 fighting incidents. Last year, Doctors Inlet Elementary had 4 fighting incidents and with the implementation of SEL strategies and the 7 mindsets, we hope to decrease the number of fights by 75%. By providing students with an outlet and strategies to reduce stress inside and outside of the classroom this number will be significantly reduced.

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.

Doctors Inlet Elementary uses 7 mindsets to build positive school culture. Parents and guardians also receive a weekly newsletter highlighting activities, photos, and upcoming events. Staff receives a weekly newsletter via email with updates and staff recognition (including birthdays and shout-outs). Students are recognized for positive behaviors via phone calls home, postcards home, and shout-outs. Monthly assemblies are held for students who have exemplified one of the 7 mindsets. SAC meets regularly to discuss school plans and concerns. PBIS team meets monthly and members communicate information to relative stakeholder groups.

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

Stakeholders include all faculty and staff, parents and guardians, community business partners, and students. Faculty and staff strive to create a safe learning environment where all students feel welcomed while utilizing engaging hands-on lessons to inspire student academic growth. Parents and guardians work in collaboration with the faculty and staff through communication in order to increase involvement and belonging, creating an environment where students are excited to learn. Community business partners provide additional resources and funding to increase school spirit and connectedness, and students have the role of taking ownership over their learning within the classroom. All of these factors work together to build and maintain a positive school culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

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