

Hernando County School District

# John D. Floyd Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# John D. Floyd Elementary School

3139 DUMONT AVE, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/fes>

## Demographics

**Principal: Joyce Lewis**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# John D. Floyd Elementary School

3139 DUMONT AVE, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/fes>

## 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-5	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	47%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of John D. Floyd Elementary School is to promote a partnership with students, parents, and the community by providing a supportive educational environment enhanced by technology that encourages problem solving and responsible choices, thus preparing all to meet tomorrow's challenges.

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

Attitude Determines Altitude...

### 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
Lewis, Joyce	Principal	To work with teachers, students, staff members and stakeholders to plan, implement, and assess school change initiatives to ensure alignment and focus on intended results. The principal also must monitor fidelity and implementation of professional development and its transfer into the academic setting. Conduct regular walkthroughs to ensure high quality standards based instruction is taking place.
Tomlinson, Melissa	Assistant Principal	To work with teachers, students, staff members and stakeholders to plan, implement, and assess school change initiatives to ensure alignment and focus on intended results. The principal also must monitor fidelity and implementation of professional development and its transfer into the academic setting. Conduct regular walkthroughs to ensure high quality standards based instruction is taking place.
Jackson, Sid	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible coordinates and teaches social skills and provides counseling for the overall well being of all students. Also part of the Threat Assessment and SBLT Teams
Lobianco, Joan	Teacher, ESE	ESE Resource and Team Leader responsible for overseeing the ESE department. The collection of data, the writing and monitoring of IEPs for Students with Disabilities subgroup.
Fox, Michelle	Other	Site based MTSS Coordinator - Coordinated MTSS parent/ teacher problem solving conferences, assists in building MTSS schedule and groups, monitors MTSS data, shares data with leadership team and faculty in order to adjust instructional practices.
Kasten, Pam	Teacher, K-12	ELA Resource teacher providing small group push-in instruction primarily to students in need of additional tiered supports
Colon, Evelyn	Teacher, K-12	Assessment teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and reporting state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data for continuous monitoring of students achievement.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Joyce Lewis

**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.*

0



**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.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

72

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

919

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

4

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

4

### 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	147	131	137	148	156	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	865
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/23/2021

## 2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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				57%	54%	57%	54%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	53%	58%	52%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	53%	51%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	58%	63%	55%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	62%	47%	53%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	48%	51%	41%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	54%	53%	49%	58%	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	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	59%	-5%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	52%	2%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	62%	-12%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	53%	-3%
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 and SAM science data

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	37	62
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	31	56
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	47	75
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	45	76
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	63	79
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42	42	49
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	30	65
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	45	58
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	34	57
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

## Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	35	38	16	27	14	21				
ELL	44	55		35							
BLK	36	55		32	27		30				
HSP	50	43	36	44	36	18	43				
MUL	65			46							
WHT	57	43	39	45	31	21	46				
FRL	53	42	44	41	31	17	41				
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	22	54	60	25	43	45	25				
ELL	65	80		55	40						
BLK	56	62		39	65						

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
HSP	58	62	75	52	48	56	43				
MUL	57	50		43	50						
WHT	57	52	49	59	52	40	54				
FRL	49	50	49	49	46	45	41				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	55	58	33	30	43					
ELL	28	44		39	44						
BLK	48	60		42	40		50				
HSP	56	62	57	56	54	48	56				
MUL	59	53		52	45		64				
WHT	54	48	50	56	46	36	44				
FRL	51	49	44	52	43	34	45				

### 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	42
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO



English Language Learners	
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	36
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	41
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

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

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

One trend that continues to be an area of concern for J.D. Floyd is our students with disabilities in all grade levels as identified in our ESSA report. The SWD subgroup scored 39% 2 points below the federal index.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is our SWD. In 2019 only 23% of the students were proficient in ELA and 25% in math. In comparison, 57% of all students at Floyd were proficient in ELA and 55% in math in 2019.

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

Two of the contributing factors are ESE inclusion teachers not serving their students for all subjects and not having a common planning period with the Gen Ed teacher. Actions taking place for this upcoming school is having all Kindergarten teacher certified in ESE and Elementary. This allows us to use the ESE teachers that would have served kindergarten to be Title 1 funds were used to pay for an additional ESE inclusion teacher. With these additional ESE inclusion teachers we will have a schedule it will allow the ESE teacher to be in with the Gen Ed teacher to be with the students for all subjects and with the teachers for common planning.

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

The component that showed the most improvement are our ELL students. In ELA our students went from 28% proficient in 2018 to 65% proficient. In math, our students went from 39% proficient in 2018 to 55% in 2019.

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

The biggest contributing factor to this improvement was ELL students were provided the opportunity to attend tutoring after school with our ELL teacher and para. During these session, students were provided with reading and math strategies specific to ELL students.

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

One strategy that will be implemented is collaborative planning for Gen Ed teachers and the ESE teachers. By providing collaborative planning time, ESE teachers can help Gen Ed teachers with strategies that will improve instruction for SWD.

**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.**

We will provide training on UDL, LETRS and Sanford Harmony.

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

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	All teachers will teach core curriculum that align with rigorous standards based instruction and will have formatives that align with the standards. Teachers will plan collaboratively in order to provide consistent rigorous based instruction to all students. Using walkthrough data for the 2020-2021 school year, our lowest areas where Designing Coherent Instruction (3.2% were Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory) and Establishing a Culture of Learning (6% Unsatisfactory).
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	-1E Designing Coherent Instruction needs improvement and unsatisfactory will decrease to less than 3% -2B Establishing a Culture of Learning unsatisfactory will decrease to under 5%
<b>Monitoring:</b>	-Any teacher who receives a NI or U satisfactory will meet with administration to discuss concerns.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	-Lesson plan checks -Lesson planning PD with our district reading coach -Administrative walkthrough -Teachers who receive multiple needs improvements or unsatisfactory will receive coaching notes or corrective action write-up.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	1. Administration will check teachers lesson plans to ensure students are planning effective lessons to reach all students. 2. Our district reading coach will meet regularly with teams to assist teachers with planning effective lessons and formatives that align with standards. 3. Administration will conduct regular walkthroughs with the teachers lesson plans to ensure the lesson being taught matches the lessons written. 4. Document teacher deficiencies in order to provide support.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Any teacher who receives a NI or U satisfactory will meet with administration to discuss concerns.

**Person Responsible** Joyce Lewis (lewis\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Lesson plans will be checked regularly to ensure teachers are planning effective lessons to reach all students.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson\_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our area of focus is our discipline and students learning self regulation skills. When reviewing our data the areas of concern are classroom disruptions and physical contact. 47% of our referrals for the 2020-2021 were for classroom disruption and disrespect and 24% for physical contact. 100 students at JD Floyd received a discipline and of that 32 students received 3 or more disciplines.

**Measurable Outcome:** We would like to reduce the number of office discipline from 236 to 200 and reduced the number of days students are in ISS to 110. Students learn better while in the classroom and by lowering the number of days in ISS student achievement will go up.

**Monitoring:** Discipline data will be monitored weekly during the SBLT meeting, during Team Leader Meetings and during teacher data chats.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson\_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- SPLASH our PBIS Program-Continual implementation of positive behavior strategies such as Club Splash, Splash Cards, and Super Splash.
- Sanford Harmony Lesson Plans
- Champions-SBLT member become Champions for the students with 3 or more disciplines to form relationships and monitor progress.
- Students identified as having behavior problems will be in small groups with our guidance counselors and social worker.
- Teachers will receive a refresher training in Zones of Regulation and how to successful implement it.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We have selected these strategies because it focuses on rewarding positive behavior and helping students better understand their feelings and how to control them. We chose the Champion strategy because research shows that students who have an adult they can confide in and look up to do a better job in both academics and behavior.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Review and retrain teachers on Zones of Regulation

**Person Responsible** Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson\_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Identified students will be pulled into small groups.

**Person Responsible** Sid Jackson (jackson\_s2@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Students will be assigned "Champions" during the first SBLT meeting.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson\_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will be introduced to Sanford Harmony lesson and will begin Meet Up Buddy Up in their classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Joyce Lewis (lewis\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The only ESSA group in our school to receive below the 41% Federal Index are our Students with disabilities at 39%. In 2019 only 22% of our students with disabilities were proficient in ELA and 25% were proficient in Math. Another factor is in our low SWD scores is the inconsistency of students having the same ESE teacher and the lack of planning time the ESE and Gen Ed teacher have together.

**Measurable Outcome:** Students with disabilities will increase their ELA proficiency to 25% and their math proficiency to 28%.

**Monitoring:** We will monitor our students with disability data using iReady diagnostics.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Joyce Lewis (lewis\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Bi-quarterly data chats with administration to monitor ESE students grades and progress.
- Data chat between SWD and ESE teacher after iReady diagnostic to review data and set goals.
- Differentiation during small group instruction and dedicated MTSS time.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

- We will monitor ESE students bi-quarterly in order to identify students who needs further interventions sooner.
- Using iReady diagnostic, teacher will create custom courses to ensure the students specific weaknesses are being addressed.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Share disaggregated math data with teachers and build small groups based on iReady data.

**Person Responsible** Evelyn Colon (colon\_e@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Monitor iReady data to ensure students are receiving the necessary time as outlined by iReady protocol.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson\_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Meet quarterly for data chats with a focus on SWD and how they are performing with MTSS.

**Person Responsible** Joyce Lewis (lewis\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Provide paras to assist with Tier II remediation allowing teachers to pull more Tier III groups. This will be monitored through MTSS logs documenting the standards addressed.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Fox (fox\_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Common planning time for ESE teachers and Gen Ed teachers.

**Person Responsible** Joyce Lewis (lewis\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Our primary discipline concern using Safe School is the incidents of Physical Contact that resulted in a discipline.**

**Our secondary concern for discipline is the number of in-school and out of school suspension. Out of 9 schools we ranked #3 and #1,103 out of 1,395 school in the state. We will use Sanford Harmony in conjunction with Zones of Regulation to help students use problem solving skills to deal with conflicts in the classroom. We will also be addressing the lack of classroom management strategies and student engagement which both impact student behavior in the classrooms. As a GOLD PBIS school we will monitor behavior weekly at our SBLT meetings and monthly at our teacher data chat.**

### **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.**

At the beginning of every school year, we host an Open House where parents are invited to meet the teachers, visit classrooms and tour the campus. During this event representatives from PTA, SAC and Boys and Girls Club are among the many organizations available to talk with families. Our Volunteer Coordinator is also available to facilitate the volunteer process with parents and family members. Parents are kept informed of their child's progress through their planners, Class Dojo and Skyward. Important information about school activities is also posted regularly on our Facebook page, website included in the global phone message to all parents. Schoolwide events are also held including Pastry for Parents, Family Math, ELA and Science nights, chorus concerts and kindergarten shows.

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

### **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00