

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf Junior High



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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Oakleaf Junior High

4085 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

http://olj.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Wilnitra Dixon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	49%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (57%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Oakleaf Junior High

4085 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://olj.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

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.

The mission of Oakleaf High School is to provide a safe, appropriate, and effective learning environment that will meet the needs of the students and assist the students in accomplishing educational goals that are significant for the world of work and for higher learning pursuits.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Oakleaf Junior High exists to prepare life long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable 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
Graham, Christy	Principal	Serves on the SAC committee, responsible for the overall vision of the school, and communicating that vision with the faculty, students, parents, and community members.
Freeman, Josh	Assistant Principal	Serves on the SAC committee, responsible for supporting the vision of the school and helping monitor goals for improvement.
Bucklin, Sara	Teacher, K-12	ELA department head, serves on SAC committee, responsible for helping implement ELA and reading initiatives.
Britt, Yalonda	Teacher, Career/Technical	Department Head, serves on SAC committee, responsible for helping implement school wide initiatives..
Bradley, David	Teacher, K-12	Social Sciences Department head, SAC Chair, responsible for leading SAC and helping implement Civics best practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Wilnitra Dixon

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.*

1

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,235

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

15

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

16

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593	642	0	0	0	0	1235
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	51	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	105	0	0	0	0	228
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	118	0	0	0	0	226
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	223	0	0	0	0	454

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	11	10	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/22/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571	598	0	0	0	0	1169
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	68	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	58	0	0	0	0	124

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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571	598	0	0	0	0	1169
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	68	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	58	0	0	0	0	124

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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				61%	61%	54%	62%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	58%	54%	61%	60%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	49%	47%	54%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				67%	69%	58%	64%	67%	58%
Math Learning Gains				70%	63%	57%	62%	60%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	56%	51%	56%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				69%	66%	51%	69%	69%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				83%	81%	72%	82%	80%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	62%	63%	-1%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	49%	5%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	66%	64%	2%	48%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	72%	-72%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	80%	3%	71%	12%

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	96%	65%	31%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady for English and Math

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8	7	9
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	4
	English Language Learners	0	0	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	24	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	4	8	14
	English Language Learners	20	9	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students		75	78
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities		61	
	English Language Learners		67	

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6	5	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	4	2	8
	English Language Learners	0	12	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	9	10
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	1	2	4
	English Language Learners	0	27	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	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	23	35	31	15	20	22	27	52	23		
ELL	25	44	46	34	37	48	35	65	27		
ASN	78	67		69	33		74	95	73		
BLK	41	41	35	33	25	18	46	71	46		
HSP	52	55	52	49	37	39	57	75	68		
MUL	54	52	29	54	33	24	63	77	70		
WHT	67	54	48	63	37	37	73	86	66		
FRL	44	41	38	38	29	27	48	71	47		
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	24	43	36	28	54	49	37	56	41		
ELL	21	53	56	25	63	71	17	76			

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
ASN	72	58		82	77		74	88	88		
BLK	52	55	49	51	63	56	58	78	67		
HSP	62	61	60	68	72	56	65	86	66		
MUL	68	61	47	77	77	73	79	85	70		
WHT	68	66	59	79	74	54	79	86	68		
FRL	51	55	45	58	66	56	55	76	60		
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	23	43	41	32	55	53	31	59			
ELL	20	57	54	33	57	43	40	42			
ASN	78	71	60	85	72	64	74	85	66		
BLK	53	58	48	51	52	47	62	79	56		
HSP	60	61	56	66	63	57	63	78	72		
MUL	62	65	71	70	65	59	68	82	72		
PAC	77	62		69	69						
WHT	67	63	55	71	68	65	76	86	68		
FRL	54	58	50	55	55	48	59	79	50		

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	40
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
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	51
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	51
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	59
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	41
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?

There is a huge gap between the percentage of level 1's/2's and level 5s. There is a small percentage of students that are level 3 or 4.

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

Math

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

Covid and online learning have contributed to lower performance. We are creating a Math Success lab that will be focused on pulling out the level 1 students to help them with their specific areas of deficiency. Math teachers have set up individual morning and afternoon tutoring sessions.

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

All areas of progress monitoring were below 2019. We did not have any areas of improvement. Contributing factors could be online learning and students not taking the assessment as serious as they might have in person.

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

Many students completed the progress monitoring at home and did not spend a lot of time on the assessments. Scores, in general, were lower than normal. The school is not offering online learning this upcoming school year.

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

The creation of the Math Success lab and before and after school tutoring. PLCs that focus on academic achievement and student improvement. Dissolved inclusion science and social studies and added part time support facilitator to support full time support facilitator. The school continues to try to go one to one with Chromebooks which should allow more access to the math programs like iReady and Savaas.

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.

The district is support PLC leaders through additional trainings on how to run and support a PLC. The PLC groups meet twice a month and once a month the administrator provides additional training and support. OLJ meets monthly with district coaches to review data and help with classroom instruction.

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

Tutoring in all core classes and the math success lab. By focusing on teacher retention, we will have all core teachers returning, it will help us to maintain and add to our professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on the review of the 2021 Math data, approximately 50% of our students were performing below grade level. Progress monitoring supports that students are below grade level.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2021-22 school year, the number of Math 2 and Math 3 (Pre Algebra) students at Oakleaf Junior High School improving their mastery of mathematics standards will increase by 10% in each grade level as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in Mathematics.

Monitoring: We will measure this through frequent administrative walkthroughs, iReady progress monitoring, and classroom formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Communities will be focused on planning together, sharing common assessments and collaborating with cross curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We meet weekly in our department or professional learning communities and so this gives us the best chance to impact our instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Consistently conducting walkthroughs, with intentional focus areas based on the OneClay Instructional vision, and providing teachers with next steps to foster best practices for teaching and student learning.
2. Working collaboratively with content area curriculum specialists to ensure the continuous development of effective instructional strategies.
3. Consistently attend, monitor and participate in the development and growth of purposeful PLCs across all content areas

Person Responsible Josh Freeman (joshua.freeman@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the review of the 2021 ELA/FSA data, approximately 50% of our students were performing below grade level. Progress monitoring supports that students are below grade level.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2021-22 school year, the number of English students at Oakleaf Junior High School improving their mastery of ELA standards will increase by 3% in each grade level as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in Reading .

Monitoring: We will measure this through frequent administrative walkthroughs, Achieve 3000 progress monitoring, and classroom formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christy Graham (christy.graham@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Communities will be focused on planning together, sharing common assessments and collaborating with cross curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We meet weekly in our department or professional learning communities and so this gives us the best chance to impact our instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Consistently conducting walkthroughs, with intentional focus areas based on the OneClay Instructional vision, and providing teachers with next steps to foster best practices for teaching and student learning.
2. Working collaboratively with content area curriculum specialists to ensure the continuous development of effective instructional strategies.
3. Consistently attend, monitor and participate in the development and growth of purposeful PLCs across all content areas

Person Responsible Christy Graham (christy.graham@myoneclay.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: We were told that tardies were not enforced during the past school year. We have made an effort to enforce the new tardy policy. At the end of the first nine weeks we have 164 tardy referrals.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2021-22 school year, 7th and 8th grade student tardy referrals will decrease 5% for the 2nd quarter from the total tardy referral from the first quarter. By the end of the 4th quarter of the 2021-22 school, 7th and 8th grade student tardy referrals will decrease 10% from the total tardy referrals from the first quarter.

Monitoring: We will continue to track the number of tardy referrals for each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Florence LaFontant (florence.lafontant@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using the PBIS system, we have created a school store where students can earn "school bucks" and buy different items. One of the ways to earn "school bucks" is by being in class on time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We currently only have a punitive system for tardies. We are using PBIS to reward the positive behavior in hopes of lowering the tardies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Created a tardy policy
2. Enforced the tardy policy consistently
3. Working with PBIS to find ways to decrease tardy referrals.
4. Create a school store to purchase items based on arriving to class on time.
5. School wide lesson on expectations for tardies for the faculty.

Person Responsible Florence LaFontant (florence.lafontant@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

While the school had an overall low rating, it did have a middle score for violent acts. This year, we have made an emphasis on preventative actions. Such as access to counselors, more monitoring in the hallways and outside. Only allowing one student to leave a classroom at a time. We can monitor this through fighting referral numbers.

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.

OLJ participates in the PBIS system , SEL and 7 mindsets to help build a positive school culture and environment. This year our leadership team worked collaboratively with our PBIS team to create our non-negotiables. By expressing these expectations in a positive tone, we have been able to create more structure and discipline. School counselors have been available to work with individual students on mental health issues. PBIS is focusing on student/teacher relationships.

The OLJ administrative teams send out a virtual newsletter to parents every week to keep all stakeholders informed of current events and news within the school.

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

- Florence Lafontant - AP in charge of PBIS
- David Bradley - SAC Chair
- Leadership Team
- Parent Volunteer Organization

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00