Clay County Schools

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://sbj.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Mary Taylor

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 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

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://sbj.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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

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 faculty and staff of S. Bryan Jennings Elementary will collaboratively work with all stakeholders to establish an inclusive, equitable, and safe learning community to support high expectations and maximum achievement in all students by identifying and meeting the unique academic, social, and emotional needs of each individual student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School exists to prepare our scholars to be adult-life ready by forming lifelong learners for success in a competitive global market.

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
Taylor, Mary	Principal	As the principal of S. Bryan Jennings Elementary, Mrs. Taylor is the instructional leader of the school. She leads the staff as they disaggregate all data sources to identify areas of strength and opportunity. She is responsible for the implementation of all state, district, and school initiatives.
Chapman, Debbie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Chapman is a school administrator responsible for supporting the principal in the instructional leadership of our school, as well as to the overall well-being and safety of the scholars and staff.
Ruckersfeldt, Jordan	Math Coach	Lead math interventions, assist with small group practices and data analysis for differentiation, and advance Eureka instruction. Additionally she serves as our school SAC Chair.
Gleneski, Nancy	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Gleneski is a Title I intervention teacher, as well as the Intervention Team Facilitator. She also leads our school's PBIS committee.
Henry, Casey	Parent Engagement Liaison	Teacher third grade and Title I Lead.
Bowen, Sherry	School Counselor	School guidance counselor providing small and large group sessions, PBIS supports and interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Mary Taylor

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

484

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

6

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

5

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	82	73	67	67	63	64	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	14	19	14	11	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	4	0	3	8	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
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	3	12	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	18	21	18	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	2	4	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Sunday 9/26/2021

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	63	69	61	66	59	60	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	12	10	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
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	63	69	61	66	59	60	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	12	10	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
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				58%	65%	57%	60%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	62%	58%	55%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	54%	53%	36%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	70%	63%	67%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	66%	62%	69%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	56%	51%	48%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	65%	53%	56%	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	67%	68%	-1%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	64%	-7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	63%	71%	-8%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
06	2021					
	2019	53%	70%	-17%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	62%	63%	-1%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready diagnostic data was used to compile the data for both ELA and Math for grades K-6. Performance Matters baseline and Winter assessments were used to compile the 5th grade Science data. Due to no longer having access to Performance Matters, we do not have subgroup data for

economically disadvantaged, ESE, or ELL categories for the Performance Matters assessments. Science FCAT was used to compile spring 5th grade Science data.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	31	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	31	66
	Students With Disabilities	6	18	29
	English Language Learners	0	17	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	28	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	28	66
	Students With Disabilities	12	24	59
	English Language Learners	17	33	40

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	41	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	41	57
	Students With Disabilities	13	30	41
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	21	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	21	57
	Students With Disabilities	0	36	53
	English Language Learners	0	0	26

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	57	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	57	62
	Students With Disabilities	14	36	42
	English Language Learners	0	17	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	24	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	24	47
	Students With Disabilities	0	12	30
	English Language Learners	0	0	57

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	47	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	47	46
	Students With Disabilities	19	44	37
	English Language Learners	17	0	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	44	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	44	60
	Students With Disabilities	19	51	57
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	37	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	37	50
	Students With Disabilities	19	37	46
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	34	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	34	55
	Students With Disabilities	25	38	51
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	18	60	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	39	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	39	44
	Students With Disabilities	8	8	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	40	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	40	60
	Students With Disabilities	16	23	39
	English Language Learners	0	0	17

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	33	22	9	42	43	45	38				
ELL	28			28							
BLK	38	39	27	36	36		33				
HSP	38	42		36	42		33				
MUL	23	30		42	30						
WHT	59	41		62	64		68				
FRL	36	36	18	41	51	50	35				

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	48	43	50	47	29	41				
ELL	30	47		45	50		30				
BLK	41	45	45	56	49	27	41				
HSP	62	53		54	59	67	70				
MUL	50	42		64	58						
WHT	67	59	47	71	62	30	68				
FRL	52	51	56	60	52	35	62				

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	43	43	22	48	50	21	33				
ELL					64						
BLK	46	60	69	59	61	44	42				
HSP	56	55		62	61						
MUL	65	56		78	79						
WHT	67	49	24	70	71	48	58				
FRL	57	59	36	65	65	47	49				

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	46
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	41
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	35
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	42
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	31
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	42
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?

Students enter the school year one to three grade levels below the expected proficiency level and show growth throughout the year with the consistent teaching practices and small group instruction that are in place. For example, iReady ELA diagnostic 1 showed students at risk of tier 3 (or 2 or more grade levels below proficiency) at 24% and by the 3rd diagnostic those students had closed significant gaps and only 12% remained within that tier 3 category. And for math they grew from diagnostic 1 showing 25% at risk for tier 3 to 8% by diagnostic 3. For both ELA and math they at least reduced the percentage of scholars at two or more grade levels behind by 50%.

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

Vocabulary and background knowledge to understand informational text continue to appear in historical data as the biggest area of need for students in ELA. In mathematical practices number sense is the greatest area of opportunity. On the iReady diagnostic in 2020-2021, the school average indicated only 29% of students were on grade level in vocabulary & comprehension of informational text was at 33% which were the two domains of greatest need. This year, iReady indicated 26% were proficient for vocabulary and 30% for comprehension of informational text. Again, these were the two areas of greatest need. Math number sense indicated 20% were proficient beginning last year based on iReady diagnostic scores and again this year in 2021 only 18% showed proficiency. This was the number one area of need for math both years.

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

Due to the lower socio-economic demographic groupings of our population, students typically have limited access to books, are not frequently read to at home, have minimal background knowledge from exposure to events and experiences outside the home. Additionally, many of our families are uncomfortable with math concepts and this carries over to our scholars.
To address these areas we are monitoring instruction through classroom walkthroughs and on-going data reviews. Professional learning communities are working to focus on lesson studies, common assessments, identifying essential standards. The Title I ELA and Math Coaches are providing support to instructional personnel with coaching cycles, model lessons, creating model classrooms, conducting data reviews, planning sessions, professional development lunch and learn opportunities, and monitoring the fluidity of small group instruction along with the support and assistance of administration.
Title I assistants provide support with small group instruction for both ELA and math. Various opportunities for professional development are provided for personnel with Lexia, i-Ready, Achieve3000, Savvas, Studies Weekly, and with specific book studies that directly support classroom instruction and student learning. Additionally, a Little Library is currently being installed outside the gates, on campus for the community to have access to books, we hold literacy event to encourage reading, and monthly strategies are shared to inform parents about ways to improve reading skills with their scholars at home. Additionally, a math night is held and math strategies and activities are shared monthly for families in the newsletter to make them more comfortable with mathematical concepts.

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

Phonemic awareness always shows great improvement through the progression of grades as students complete all foundational levels of instruction. Gaps in skills and standards significantly reduce throughout the years as well in an analysis of student data indicating that students are showing progress, even if they are not at grade level proficiency.

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

Data driven small group instruction and implementation of curriculum with fidelity. Consistency and more structured PLC work. We are utilizing student data notebooks for students to track their data data throughout the year and take ownership of their learning. Conferences are held routinely with students to ensure they are able to set smart goals, track their progress, and reset goals once they have either reached them or need to readdress their target. By allowing them to know what proficiency levels are and where they are on the trajectory they have more authenticity and meaning in their learning when they are in small groups and understand the gaps in skills they need to build to get to higher levels of performance. This also allows them to understand that learning is truly differentiated and not a one size fits all format so they can embrace a growth mindset to focus on their achievements rather than compete with their peers.

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

Time blocked off and dedicated to teacher PLC work, continual analysis of student data to determine next steps.
Additionally, student chromebooks and earbuds are needed to support full implementation of the Lexia and i-Ready programs. Each of these programs allow for differentiated and strategic interventions to be addressed. The programs provide diagnostic assessments and reports along with skill builder lessons. They also have individualized student learning paths for scholars to access in

the online modules that are interactive and help them master skills and standards in ELA or Math so they are closing learning gaps outside of core instructional time which is critical.

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.

Coaching cycles, data dives, a dedicated meeting space for common team planning and PLCs, lunch and learns, Google Classrooms for teacher use.

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

Retaining Title I instructional Coaches and classroom assistants, and continuing to build upon the strong PLC foundation that is being established this school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SBJ's area of focus in ELA will be enhancing instructional practices based upon our data which showed a school-wide ELA achievement decrease from 58% proficient in 2019 to 46% in 2021. Additionally, ELA learning gains decreased by 20%. This decreased proficiency significantly impacts student learning and literacy; decreased proficiency in reading means that students will be unable to tackle grade level texts, which will continue to widen the already prevalent literacy gap. Increasing proficiency in ELA by refining and enhancing instructional practices is critical to students succeeding in all aspects of grade level curriculum. Our area of focus was identified as a critical area of need through analysis of 2020-2021 end of year assessment data (IReady and FSA) and 2021-2022 baseline assessment data (IReady and Achieve 3000). Our 2020-2021 end of year IReady data indicated that 92% of kindergartners (59 of 68 students), 66% of first graders (39 of 61 students), and 57% of second graders (30 of 54 students) were at proficiency in ELA. Our baseline IReady data for this year shows that only 4% of kindergartners (3 of 78 students), 6% of first graders (4 of 71 students), and 12% of second graders (8 of 65 students) are on track to be at proficiency by the end of the school year. Our 2021 ELA FSA results showed the following: 22 out of 60 third grade students scored at or above proficiency; 29 out of 56 fourth graders; 26 out 55 fifth graders; and 27 out of 57 sixth graders at or above proficiency. Our baseline Achieve 3000 data shows 4% of third graders (2 of 55 students), 12% of fourth graders (7 of 58 students), 23% of fifth graders (13 of 61 students), and 18% of sixth graders(12 of 68 students) are meeting or exceeding proficiency in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	If all teachers implement high impact instructional practices with fidelity for core instruction and address learning gaps through small group instruction, SBJ's ELA levels of proficiency in ELA will increase by 20% to at least 65% on the 2021-2022 ELA assessment. Specifically, all K-6 proficiency levels will improve. We will increase the percentage of Kindergarteners on track to proficiency from baseline assessments by 80%, 1st grade by 70%, and 2nd grade by 60% by the iReady end of year diagnostic assessments. The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA assessment will increase from 2020-2021 for 3rd grade by 30%, 4th grade by 20%, 5th grade by 20%, and 6th grade by 30% so all grade levels have above 60% proficiency levels.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through ongoing data analysis, diagnostics, benchmark assessments, and common formative assessments. By the iReady mid year assessment we should see Kindergarten proficiency levels up by 50% to 54%, 1st grade by 40% to 46%, and 2nd grade by 35% to 47%. Additionally, our 3rd grade students should show that 15% more students are mastering standards to show proficiency on mid year assessments, 10% of 4th grade, 10% of 5th grade, and 15% of 6th graders as well based on progress monitoring, benchmark assessments, and common formative assessments. At mid year, intensive data analysis will occur to ensure we are on track to achieve the goal and adjustments in instruct will occur based on specific student needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SBJ has chosen three strategies to amplify our ELA instruction this year; an Evidence-based Program that adresses identified gaps aligned with the 5 components of reading (Lexia Core5), Explicit Vocabulary Instruction, and Small Group Instruction. Lexia Core5 is a blended program that addresses identified gaps in all struggling learners. This will be monitored by Teacher and Administrator 5minute checks on a weekly basis, walkthroughs, observations, small group instruction, and data reviews. Explicit vocabulary instruction will be utilized with all curriculum resources to enhance literacy during small and whole group

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	instruction. This will be monitored through checks for understanding (ie. Savvas vocabulary development, formative assessments, exit slips), online resources (iReady, Achieve, or Lexia), walkthroughs and observations, data reviews, and diagnostic assessments. Small group instruction will be practiced in all subject areas to close instructional gaps and enrich student learning. This will be monitored through walkthroughs and observations, data analysis, and ongoing PLC work with common assessments. FSA 20-21 data, iReady, and Lexia baseline assessment data shows that lower quartile gains are a critical area of need. Lexia Core5 is an evidence based program that addresses identified gaps in student learning and aligns with the 5 components of reading. The program allows for data driven differentiation which strategically closes individual literacy learning gaps and provides explicit instructional opportunities to teachers with provided lesson components that can be administered in a small group setting. Embedded assessment provides ongoing, actionable data to help teachers prioritize and plan offline instruction. Lexia Core 5 has a strong ESSA rating and used correctly we will replicate positive outcomes. Explicit vocabulary instruction is another instructional practice we will implement due to historical data indicating vocabulary as an area of opportunity across all grade levels. The National Reading Panel (NICHD, 2000) identified vocabulary as one of five major components of reading. Its importance to overall reading comprehension is widely documented. The National Reading Panel (NRP) stated that vocabulary plays an important role both in learning to read and in comprehending text: readers cannot understand text without knowing what most of the words mean. Therefore we will explicitly teach vocabulary to students, to increase proficiency. Small group instruction is an essential practice to ameliorate. Data trends highlight students who are below grade level proficiency in ELA struggle with multiple reading components. Providing focused, intensive, small group interventions for identified students at risk for reading deficiencies including the 5 core reading elements will close the learning gaps and improve overall literacy. Research shows small group instruction is beneficial for all learners, but specifically closes learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided for best instructional practices associated with Lexia Core5, Savvas, Achieve 3000, and iReady.
Professional development will be provided to teachers on standards based, whole group and small group explicit instruction .
Instructional practices will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs, observations, PLC work, and data analysis of student progress.
Student data will be monitored weekly to determine targeted instructional needs of small groups to close gaps.
County reading specialists will provide weekly support on campus to ELA teachers K-6, through co-planning, coaching cycles, data conversations, and crafting common assessments to leverage instructional practices.
Our Title I ELA Coach will provide coaching cycles, planning sessions, and model lessons to assist teachers with improved instructional practices.
The Title I ELA Coach will support small group instructional practices by assisting with interventions, monitoring data and student progress, and assisting teachers with planning for small groups.
Professional development will be provided to teachers on Lexia Core5 and how to implement the blended program using chromebooks and small group instruction. Additional chromebooks and earbuds will be needed for students to access the program.
Administration and the Title I ELA Coach will identify model classrooms within the school to leverage best teaching practices in whole group and small group instruction. Teachers will have opportunities to participate in learning walks to view instructional moves within the model classrooms and debrief afterwards to replicate the examples in their own classrooms.

Professional development will be provided to Title I teaching assistants to provide support for students during small group instruction. Teachers will provide the materials that will be utilized which will be differentiated based upon student data.
Teachers will work collaboratively with students to create individualized scholar data notebooks for progress monitoring and accountability. Data will be updated and reviewed frequently. Students will know and understand their purpose for whole and small group instruction as well as set goals for achievement.
A central location dedicated to professional development, data analysis, ongoing PLC work, and planning will be created (Data Dugout). All instructional staff will have access to this location and resources to support best practices will be provided.

Person Responsible Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math is a needed skill, which impacts students' learning and success in life. Students must be able to comprehend and apply mathematical concepts, operations, and relations accurately and efficiently in order to become skilled problem solvers. SBJ's lower quartile learning gains have soared 30% between 2019 and 2021; however, overall learning gains decreased from 57% in 2019 to 40% in 2021. Additionally, there was a 14% decrease in overall math proficiency (63% in 2019 to 49% in 2021). This data indicates that there is a critical need to increase proficiency across all domains of math instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	If the Eureka Math curriculum is taught with fidelity and small group instruction is being implemented with differentiation to students' individual math needs, then SBJ's overall learning gains will increase 10% to at least 50% on the 2021-2022 math assessment. In turn, this should increase our overall math proficiency to at least 55%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and observations, monthly data dives, monitoring of individual I-Ready learning paths, and diagnostic, benchmark, and common formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	If all teachers are using the Eureka math curriculum with fidelity, and if they are implementing small group instruction that is targeted and data-driven with evidence based interventions, then SBJ will increase student learning gains and proficiency in mathematics 10% to at least 50% on the 2021-2022 math assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that there are mutually reinforcing benefits of blending proficiency of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and automatic recall of facts in math instruction. Eureka Math has all of these pieces. Research also shows that small group and differentiated instruction close learning gaps and increase proficiency. Baseline I-Ready data shows that this is still a critical area of need. Utilizing I-Ready data, instructional grouping profiles and prerequisite reports, and Teacher Toolbox gives teachers the resources to help close achievement gaps. Additionally, the math coach will assist in monitoring student data and providing additional interventions and supports.

Action Steps to Implement

Eureka training for all math teachers.
Professional development for targeted and data-driven small group instruction, using evidence based strategies and interventions.
On-going data analysis to ensure fluid small groups and closure of learning gaps.
Support of small group interventions and instruction by math coach, administration, and district level curriculum coaches.
Coaching cycles, walkthroughs, and model lessons with math coach and district coaches to ensure highly effective, targeted, differentiated instruction.
Title I classroom assistants aid in providing small group instruction that is differentiated.
Establish model classrooms to leverage best teaching practices on campus.
Utilize chromebooks and earbuds for targeted individualized instructional centers during small group instruction on a daily basis.
Develop and maintain student data notebooks for accountability and progress monitoring.
Initiate dedicated data dugouit to allow vertical planning, data discussions, and ongoing PLC work.
MAFS for small group instructional purposes and targeted tutoring cycles that are data driven.

Person Responsible Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data from the 2020-2021 school year shows that SBJ had a decrease in overall referrals, as well as a decrease in the severity of the referrals that were written. In 2019-2020, the majority of referrals stemmed from common areas around campus, such as the playground, cafeteria, and restrooms. The decrease in referrals in the 2020-2021 school year in these common areas can be attributed to our common expectations signage posted all around campus. Classroom disruptions were another major area of concern, both in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school year, specifically with inappropriate conduct. By continuing to improve our school culture, explicitly teaching social-emotional skills through the 7 Mindsets curriculum, having our set of common school-wide expectations, and addressing problem areas, our teacher/student engagement will improve and negative behavior will decrease.
Measurable Outcome:	In an effort to emphasize positive behaviors, increase student engagement, and promote a positive schoolwide culture, we will continue our Pawsitive Referral Program where students are recognized for exemplary behavior. We expect to recognize at least 40% of our students. This would be a 15% increase of students recognized in the 2020-2021 school year.
Monitoring:	Our PBIS team will track the number of Pawsitive Referrals that are turned into the front office. The PBIS team will meet to problem solve on a monthly basis. Walkthroughs to ensure fidelity of PAWS behavior expectations will be conducted frequently.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	If the 7 Mindsets SEL curriculum is embedded into classrooms to support PBIS, specifically with daily morning meetings, then positive student behavior, student and teacher engagement, and student and teacher ownership will increase by 15% and at least 40% of students will receive recognition. In turn, this will improve the overall school environment and culture.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When all teachers establish a classroom community to support the Positive Behavior System (PBIS) through daily morning meetings and use of 7 Mindsets curriculum, then student and teacher engagement and ownership in their educational goals will increase. SBJ has a PBIS vertical team which supports staff with positive behavior goals. All faculty and staff will support PBIS by giving PRIDE slips and Pawsitive referrals, as well as implementing other initiatives developed by PBIS to support positive behavior throughout the school year.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development on SEL and de-escalation techniques.
Continue 7 Mindsets use campus-wide K-6.
Campus-wide Morning Meetings K-6.
Continuously update and improve staff PBIS "Playbook" with teacher expectations.
Support staff, resource teachers, and resource officer to push into classrooms and work with scholars on SEL strategies.
PBIS Team to meet monthly and monitor school-wide implementation and provide professional development and resources for staff.
Utilize Smart Suite for Smartboards to increase student engagement in classrooms.
Buddy program for students to solifify foundational acadmeic skills & develop interpersonal & leadership skills.
Book the month program to correlate with monthly character trait/mindset and promote SEL.

Book study with PBIS team to share with grade levels on 'Lost at School' focusing on restorative justice practices.

Person Responsible Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Administration will ensure engagement is peaked by solidifying PBIS as a school expectation and culture by embedding SEL into our daily instruction through morning meetings, utilizing the 7 Mindsets curriculum. A team of school staff will form the PBIS committee joined by administration to also provide resources and professional development regarding student engagement, SEL strategies, and the 7 Mindsets curriculum. By continuing to solidify the school's PBIS program, the school's discipline will continue to increase. Additionally, students will gain new skill sets, such as emotional regulation, coping strategies, and social skills, enabling them to become more aware of their own emotions and more healthy ways to process them.

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.

SBJ is creating a Parent Volunteer Organization to help train parents to give positive support to their child's education. Due to COVD-19 restrictions, we are utilizing a virtual format to begin the first semester. We will host our annual Parent Night, Literacy Night, Math Night, Orientation/Open House, along with monthly grade level curriculum discussions, and other opportunities for stakeholders to support the needs of SBJ. The SBJ School Improvement Plan, along with the Parent and Family Engagement Plan, is developed and reviewed yearly with parent, teacher, and community input and is made available to LEA, parents, and the public in an easy to read printed format at the front desk of SBJ and on the SBJ website. SBJ utilizes social media platforms such as Facebook and Instagram to keep families informed of upcoming events, as well as provide strategies and tips for families to support their scholars' learning at home.

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

Teachers & staff, administration, parents and families, and community members and business partners are all stakeholders and have an integral role in promoting a positive culture and environment in the school. Through our School Advisory Council, all stakeholders have a say in how our scholars are engaged at school and how SBJ maintains a positive school environment.