**Clay County Schools** 

# Thunderbolt 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               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 23 |

## **Thunderbolt Elementary School**

2020 THUNDERBOLT RD, Fleming Island, FL 32003

http://tbe.oneclay.net

## **Demographics**

**Principal: Amy Bathurst** 

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2021

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | No  |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 37%   |
| 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 (73%)<br>2017-18: A (75%)<br>2016-17: A (70%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | rmation*  |
| 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### **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        | 23 |

## **Thunderbolt Elementary School**

2020 THUNDERBOLT RD, Fleming Island, FL 32003

http://tbe.oneclay.net

## **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2020-21 Title I Schoo | l Disadvant | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-6            | School   | No                    |             | 27%  |
| Primary Servio                  | • •      | Charter School        | (Reporte    | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                    |             | 34%  |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                       |             |  |
| Year                            | 2020-21  | 2019-20               | 2018-19     | 2017-18  |
| Grade                           |          | Α                     | А           | Α  |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

## 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 statement of Thunderbolt Elementary is to provide a safe academic environment in which children and staff are encouraged to strive for excellence in scholarship and sociability while showing respect for self and others.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Thunderbolt Elementary prepares life-long learners to attain academic and applicable life skills that lead to success in a global and competitive workplace.

## 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| Vann,<br>Amy       | Principal              | <ul> <li>Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems.</li> <li>Engages all stakeholders, and collaborates in all school decision-making processes.</li> <li>Oversees instruction and serves as the curriculum leader of the school.</li> </ul> |
| Finely,<br>Tracey  | Assistant<br>Principal | <ul> <li>Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems under the direction of the principal.</li> <li>Serves as an instructional and curricular leader.</li> </ul>   |
| Miller,<br>Jeffrey | Assistant<br>Principal | <ul> <li>Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems under the direction of the principal.</li> <li>Serves as an instructional and curricular leader.</li> </ul>   |
| Bell,<br>Shelley   | School<br>Counselor    | <ul> <li>Provides Social and Emotional learning support to students.</li> <li>Provides SEL instruction to students K - 6</li> <li>Coordinates state testing</li> </ul>   |

## **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Thursday 9/9/2021, Amy Bathurst

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.

6

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.

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

868

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

14

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

13

**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 |       |
|--|-------------|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1   | 2  | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 104         | 126 | 98 | 145 | 122 | 122 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 865   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 23          | 40  | 16 | 27  | 36  | 28  | 38  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 208   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 2           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 4     |
| 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  | 0   | 4   | 7   | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 4   | 12  | 12  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 28    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 6  | 6   | 5   | 5   | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 27    |
|  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |       |
|  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |       |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4  | 5   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

## The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/9/2021

## 2020-21 - As Reported

## The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 115         | 102 | 134 | 107 | 114 | 142 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 837   |
| 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   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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   | 4   | 7   | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 4   | 12  | 12  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3  | 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 |       |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator                                 | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 115         | 102 | 134 | 107 | 114 | 142 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 837   |
| 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   | 4   | 7   | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 4   | 12  | 12  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 28    |

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

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

## The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

## **School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2021   |          |       |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |       |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 82%    | 65%      | 57%   | 79%    | 63%      | 56%   |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 72%    | 62%      | 58%   | 66%    | 59%      | 55%   |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 59%    | 54%      | 53%   | 55%    | 50%      | 48%   |  |  |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 82%    | 70%      | 63%   | 84%    | 69%      | 62%   |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 72%    | 66%      | 62%   | 83%    | 68%      | 59%   |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 67%    | 56%      | 51%   | 75%    | 56%      | 47%   |  |  |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 80%    | 65%      | 53%   | 84%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 85%    | 68%      | 17%                               | 58%   | 27%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 74%    | 64%      | 10%                               | 58%   | 16%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -85%   | ·        |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 81%    | 62%      | 19%                               | 56%   | 25%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -74%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 84%    | 64%      | 20%                               | 54%   | 30%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -81%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 83%    | 71%      | 12%                               | 62%   | 21%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 74%    | 69%      | 5%                                | 64%   | 10%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -83%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 81%    | 64%      | 17%                               | 60%   | 21%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -74%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 82%    | 70%      | 12%                               | 55%   | 27%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -81%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            | SCIENCE  |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            | 2019     | 77%    | 63%      | 14%                               | 53%   | 24%                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

Grades 1, 2, and 3: iReady and Lexia Grades 4, 5, and 6: iReady, Achieve, Lexia

Grade 5 Science: Performance Matters (fall and winter) and FCAT (spring)

|                          |  | Grade 1                       |                                       |                                       |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                          | Winter                                | Spring                                |
|                          | All Students   | 28                            | 52                                    | 71                                    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 28                            | 52                                    | 71                                    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 25                            | 39                                    | 59                                    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                                     |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                          | Winter                                | Spring                                |
|                          | All Students   | 14                            | 46                                    | 72                                    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 14                            | 46                                    | 72                                    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 21                            | 25                                    | 62                                    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 0                             | 0                                     | 0                                     |
|                          |  | Grade 2                       |                                       |                                       |
|                          |  | Grade 2                       |                                       |                                       |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                          | Winter                                | Spring                                |
|                          | Proficiency All Students   |                               | Winter<br>69                          | Spring<br>82                          |
| English Language<br>Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged  | Fall                          |                                       |                                       |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities  | Fall<br>45                    | 69                                    | 82                                    |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  | <b>Fall</b> 45 45             | 69<br>69                              | 82<br>82                              |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  | Fall 45 45 28 100 Fall        | 69<br>69<br>56<br>100<br>Winter       | 82<br>82<br>78<br>100<br>Spring       |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students                            | Fall<br>45<br>45<br>28<br>100 | 69<br>69<br>56<br>100                 | 82<br>82<br>78<br>100                 |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 45 45 28 100 Fall        | 69<br>69<br>56<br>100<br>Winter       | 82<br>82<br>78<br>100<br>Spring       |
| Arts                     | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically               | Fall 45 45 28 100 Fall 21     | 69<br>69<br>56<br>100<br>Winter<br>55 | 82<br>82<br>78<br>100<br>Spring<br>74 |

|                          |  | Grade 3                      |                                      |                                       |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                         | Winter                               | Spring                                |
|                          | All Students   | 59                           | 72                                   | 76                                    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 59                           | 72                                   | 76                                    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 38                           | 58                                   | 60                                    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 17                           | 50                                   | 50                                    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                         | Winter                               | Spring                                |
|                          | All Students   | 16                           | 45                                   | 75                                    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 16                           | 45                                   | 75                                    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 17                           | 29                                   | 83                                    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 0                            | 17                                   | 67                                    |
|                          |  |                              |                                      |                                       |
|                          |  | Grade 4                      |                                      |                                       |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Grade 4 Fall                 | Winter                               | Spring                                |
|                          | Proficiency All Students   |                              | Winter<br>59                         | Spring<br>66                          |
| English Language<br>Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged  | Fall                         |                                      |                                       |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities  | Fall<br>40                   | 59                                   | 66                                    |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  | <b>Fall</b> 40 40            | 59<br>59                             | 66<br>66                              |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  | Fall 40 40 19 50 Fall        | 59<br>59<br>32<br>50<br>Winter       | 66<br>66<br>48<br>100<br>Spring       |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students                            | Fall<br>40<br>40<br>19<br>50 | 59<br>59<br>32<br>50                 | 66<br>66<br>48<br>100                 |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 40 40 19 50 Fall        | 59<br>59<br>32<br>50<br>Winter       | 66<br>66<br>48<br>100<br>Spring       |
| Arts                     | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically               | Fall 40 40 19 50 Fall 22     | 59<br>59<br>32<br>50<br>Winter<br>50 | 66<br>66<br>48<br>100<br>Spring<br>74 |

|                          |  | Grade 5 |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 47      | 59     | 70     |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 47      | 59     | 70     |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 24      | 35     | 39     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 100     | 100    | 100    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 31      | 59     | 72     |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 31      | 59     | 72     |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 19      | 30     | 46     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 50      | 50     | 100    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Science                  | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 17      | 78     | 70     |
|                          |  | Grade 6 |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 48      | 58     | 67     |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 48      | 58     | 67     |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 19      | 31     | 42     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 0       | 20     | 40     |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 43      | 62     | 72     |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged Students With   | 43      | 62     | 72     |
|                          | Disabilities   | 15      | 28     | 48     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 40      | 40     | 60     |

## **Subgroup Data Review**

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 52          | 58        | 50                | 60           | 57         | 48                 | 56          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 53          |           |                   | 71           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 88          |           |                   | 94           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 47          | 58        | 38                | 50           | 50         | 36                 | 41          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 67          | 61        | 45                | 67           | 75         |                    | 57          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 70          | 91        |                   | 65           | 73         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 76          | 68        | 63                | 80           | 66         | 57                 | 78          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 67          | 57        | 45                | 63           | 59         | 59                 | 42          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel            |
| SWD       | 65          | 55        | 41                | 74           | 79         | 80                 | 66          |            |              | 2017-10                 | 2017-10                   |
| ELL       | 42          | 53        | 42                |              | 59         | 50                 | 00          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 88          | 67        | 72                | 92           | 89         | 30                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 77          | 75        |                   | 74           | 66         |                    | 67          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 69          | 63        | 60                | 72           | 63         | 53                 | 74          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 83          | 69        | 00                | 83           | 69         | - 55               | 7-7         |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 85          | 74        | 61                | 84           | 73         | 69                 | 86          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 74          | 70        | 56                | 76           | 74         | 71                 | 65          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 1         |                   | DL GRAD      |            |                    |             | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 59          | 62        | 44                | 67           | 73         | 77                 | 68          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 67          | 80        |                   | 80           | 80         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 86          | 83        |                   | 91           | 83         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 73          | 57        | 47                | 80           | 80         | 71                 | 67          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 76          | 50        | 50                | 80           | 81         | 80                 | 93          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 77          | 75        |                   | 81           | 100        |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 81          | 69        | 55                | 85           | 82         | 73                 | 84          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 74          | 67        | 60                | 77           | 80         | 68                 | 74          |            |              |                         |                           |

## **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         | 70 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0  |

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 100 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 563 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 97% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 54  |
| 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                                       | 75  |
| 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  | 91  |
| 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                                 | 46  |
| 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   | 62  |
| 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   | 75       |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   |          |  |  |  |
| 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   | 70       |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | 70<br>NO |  |  |  |
|  | +        |  |  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | +        |  |  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                                      | +        |  |  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%  Economically Disadvantaged Students | NO       |  |  |  |

#### **Analysis**

#### **Data Analysis**

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

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

The trend that emerges is in ELA and begins with our grade 3 students with disabilities and continues until grade 6.

The second trend is in math and begins with our grade 5 students with disabilities and continues until grade 6.

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

The greatest need for improvement is with our students with disabilities in ELA. The data components that support this need include the 2019 state assessments and iReady diagnostics.

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

Thunderbolt Elementary has a new administrative team for the 21-22 school year. Our hypothesis for the trend based on data from 2019 is differentiated, small-group instruction was not meeting the needs of our SWD's as well as a (possible) scheduling issue with our Inclusion instructors. During the spring of 2021, the administrative team and inclusion teachers spent a day planning with

two members from the Florida Inclusion Network. FIN assisted with analyzing SWD data and then scheduling students and inclusion teachers. Since the new school year started, we have had to make adjustments to their schedules. We made adjustments with the help of a team member from FIN. Another action needed to address this area of need for improvement is to ensure differentiated, small-group instruction is being well-planned and facilitated with fidelity by all Thunderbolt teachers.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were all students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities in grades 1 and 2 with both ELA and Math.

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

The contributing factors to the improvements were the addition of a few new team members for both the first and second-grade teams.

Another contributing factor would be classroom walkthroughs and resulting administrative feedback/ conversation with teachers.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning with our SWD's:

- streamline curriculum while focusing on our new BEST standards in ELA
- customize instruction
- continue to plan and use small group instruction
- continue to plan for best use of inclusion teacher time

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 professional development opportunities are ongoing and include:

- Content area PLC's that focus on instructional strategies to deepen educator knowledge and methods to increase academic outcomes
- Ongoing professional development with our new curriculum materials
- Ongoing professional development with identifying and supporting students identified with substantial learning gaps

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

We continue to conduct classroom walkthroughs at Thunderbolt Elementary. During the walkthroughs, our school district has identified specific indicators that when implemented effectively in classrooms, results in academic gains.

We will also be implementing updated multi-tier systems of support to assist teachers with closing gaps in reading and math.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

## Areas of Focus:

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

An area of focus is instructional practices in ELA for our students with disabilities in grades 3 - 6. This area of focus is based on our 20-21 iReady diagnostic data and our

2021 ELA FSA data.

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

The measurable outcome in grade 3 will be based on Lexia scores and our goal is for

45% of students to be 'On Target'.

The measurable outcome in grades 4 - 6 will be based on 2022 FSA scores and our

goal is to increase to 59%.

Our area of focus will be monitored through administrator classroom walkthroughs, monitoring Lexia data usage for grades 3 - 6, quarterly data chats, and classroom

walkthroughs with our district curriculum coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Vann (amy.vann@myoneclay.net)

Standards-based instruction utilizing SAVVAS curriculum materials, small group instruction based on specific student needs, Lexia Core5 for grades 3 - 5 and Lexia PowerUp for 6th grade.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Our chosen practices and curriculums have strong evidence-based data to improve student achievement.

## **Action Steps to Implement**

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

| #2. Instructional P                          | #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale:     | An area of focus is instructional practices in Math for our students with disabilities in grades 5 - 6. This area of focus is based on our 20-21 iReady Diagnostic data and our 2021 Math FSA data. |  |  |  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                       | The measurable outcome for 5th and 6th grades will be based on D3 iReady data. Our goal for both 5th and 6th grade SWD's is to improve by 2% as compared to D3, 20/21 school year.                  |  |  |  |
| Monitoring:                                  | Our area of focus will be monitored through administrator classroom walkthroughs, monitoring iReady data, our quarterly data chats, and classroom walks conducted with district curriculum coaches. |  |  |  |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome:   | Jeffrey Miller (jeffrey.miller@myoneclay.net)   |  |  |  |
| Evidence-based Strategy:                     | Standards-based instruction utilizing Eureka curriculum materials, iReady usage, and small group instruction based on specific student needs.   |  |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy: | Our chosen practices and curriculums have strong evidence-based data to improve student achievement.  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |

## **Action Steps to Implement**

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

## #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of

**Focus** An area of focus is instructional practices relating to student engagement in school,

Description and

specifically focusing on positive peer relations. This area was identified from the results of our 20/21 school climate survey.

Rationale:

**Measurable** The measurable outcome in the area of positive peer relations will be to increase by 10%

**Outcome:** on the 21/22 school climate survey.

Monitoring:

Our area of focus will be monitored through guidance lessons with the 7 Mindsets as well

as student discussions that result from the lessons.

Person responsible

**for** [no one identified]

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based Strategy:

The 7 Mindsets is a curriculum centered on Bloom's Taxonomy and aligned to 10 Social and Emotional Learning Competencies. The 7 Mindsets is made up of 6 courses that inspire and empower elementary students. The 6 courses have 28 learning objectives that incorporate student interaction and participation.

Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: The 7 Mindsets is based on positive psychology and the curriculum is developed to prevent the need for intervention in the future. The curriculum is provided by our school district and our guidance counselors facilitate the majority of the lessons. Classroom teachers facilitate lessons too.

## **Action Steps to Implement**

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

## **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Thunderbolt Elementary is ranked 636 out of 1,395 elementary schools in Florida. However, we had zero property incidents and 0 drug/public order incidents so for those two areas, Thunderbolt Elementary was ranked number 1 in the state of Florida. When comparing our annual suspensions from 2019-2020, we ranked high in the state of Florida with a total number of 39 suspensions. Our primary area of concern is to reduce our total number of suspensions during the 21/22 school year. Our teachers have established positive behavior plans within their classrooms to help prevent negative behaviors. They also communicate with parents/guardians for both positive and negative behaviors. Another method to decrease suspensions at Thunderbolt is facilitated through our guidance counselors. Our guidance counselors are available to chat with students, listen to students, mediate with students but also hold them accountable for their actions.

We have a PBIS team that meets monthly to review student data and when necessary, schedule meetings with parents, our social worker, guidance counselors, and a member of the administration team to address areas of concern, including behavior. The team puts a plan in place to follow up with the family and if necessary, provides resources to assist with seeking outside help. This is another method for decreasing suspensions.

The administrative team, along with guidance counselors, will monitor the discipline data and when necessary, meet to address issues that may arise throughout the school year.

## 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.

Thunderbolt Elementary builds a positive school culture through:

- Regular theme-based treats for all staff facilitated by the administrative team.
- The administration team makes it a priority to be available for all staff members to problem-solve, support, and listen.
- The administration team makes it a priority to quickly address behavior concerns and ensure a positive learning environment for staff.
- The Thunderbolt PFA works to raise funds to support teacher requests and support academics in a plethora of methods.
- The Thunderbolt PFA has established relationships with local business partners that financially support teacher and school-wide requests. For example, in September of 2021, the PFA established a partnership

with a company that donated a 3-D printer and supplies for our new STEM resource teacher and our robotics team. This company also committed to presentations for our 5th and 6th grade students to encourage engineering and science interests.

- Thunderbolt Elementary has established relationships with area churches that provide treats for our staff as well as toiletries and basic clothing for children in need.
- Thunderbolt Elementary has established a relationship with a family that provides food every week that is sent home for children in need to supplement meals on weekends.
- Thunderbolt Elementary provides Thanksgiving baskets and toys for families in need.

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

- Regular theme-based treats for all staff facilitated by the administrative team.
- The administration team makes it a priority to be available for all staff members to problem-solve, support, and listen.
- The administration team makes it a priority to quickly address behavior concerns and ensure a positive learning environment for staff.
- The Thunderbolt PFA works to raise funds to support teacher requests and support academics in a plethora of methods.
- The Thunderbolt PFA has established relationships with local business partners that financially support teacher and school-wide requests. For example, in September of 2021, the PFA established a partnership with a company that donated a 3-D printer and supplies for our new STEM resource teacher and our robotics team. This company also committed to presentations for our 5th and 6th grade students to encourage engineering and science interests.
- Thunderbolt Elementary has established relationships with area churches that provide treats for our staff as well as toiletries and basic clothing for children in need.
- Thunderbolt Elementary has established a relationship with a family that provides food every week that is sent home for children in need to supplement meals on weekends.
- Thunderbolt Elementary provides Thanksgiving baskets and toys for families in need.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math               | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | \$0.00 |
|   |        | Total:   | \$0.00 |