Sallie Jones Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sallie Jones Elementary School

1230 NARRANJA ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/sje

Demographics

Principal: Jennie Hoke

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.](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

Sallie Jones Elementary School

1230 NARRANJA ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/sje

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	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

SJE Tigers will be innovative leaders striving for excellence through high expectations and a commitment to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Tomorrow's Leaders Today!

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
Hoke, Jennie	Principal	Principal: The principal serves as the instructional leader for the school. She co chairs the Partnership and Performance Committee and serves on our School Advisory Committee. She is also a member of our Literacy Leadership Team and heads up our Title One program initiatives. She also serves as a liaison to our PTO.
Gosser, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for parent and family communication through our School Messenger System. She also oversees school safety and facilities. She is a co chair of the SPPC, and a member of PPC, Literacy Leadership Team, Lighthouse Team, and a liaison to PTO and SAC. She assists with student discipline and parent conferences, and works with the school social worker to monitor attendance data and build relationships with students and families. She also assists the Lead Teacher in analyzing data and facilitating team meetings.
Buscemi, Tina	Instructional Coach	The Lead Teacher is an Instructional Coach who provides professional development in curricular and instructional areas. She provides coaching and mentoring to new as well as seasoned teachers. She facilitates team meetings and assists teachers in analyzing data and developing action plans with grade levels to assist with student achievement.
Imhoof, Patty	Psychologist	The Psychologist provides diagnostic testing analysis for individual students to track strengths and weaknesses. She work with our MTSS system during TST. She also creates BIPs for students struggling with behavior and supports teachers in implementing these plans.
Thomas, Shakira	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor serves as the head of our TST. She schedules and facilitates weekly meetings to track progress of struggling learners through the MTSS process. She also provides counseling services for students and families and serves as a liaison with community volunteers. She supports English Language Learners with curriculum resources and oversees WIDA testing for this population.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/30/2021, Jennie Hoke

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.*

4

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

673

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

6

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

10

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	115	132	119	107	111	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	2	27	25	18	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	14	12	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	1	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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

Monday 8/30/2021

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	105	106	77	76	75	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
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	9	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	105	106	77	76	75	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
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	9	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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				71%	62%	57%	65%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	57%	58%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	53%	33%	41%	48%
Math Achievement				77%	63%	63%	79%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	54%	62%	73%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	42%	51%	46%	39%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	54%	53%	59%	66%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	69%	7%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	70%	10%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	60%	17%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

k-2 Students were given the iReady diagnostic as the progress monitoring tool whereas grades 3-5 were given the APM assessment as the progress monitoring tool as provided by the State.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25/24%	55/47%	89/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14%	22/40%	41/71%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	3/20%	7/47%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21/20%	61/53%	94/78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/6%	26/47%	42/72%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	4/27%	10/67%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40/45%	64/64%	88/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/44%	22/65%	35/83%
	Students With Disabilities	3/23%	6/40%	12/75%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18/20%	58/58%	85/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/16%	17/50%	30/73%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	3/14%	10/67%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	1/33%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38/40%	73/74%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/27%	30/68%	-
	Students With Disabilities	2/17%	9/75%	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20/22%	46/46%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/10%	18/41%	-
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/17%	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37/51%	50/60%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/46%	18/55%	-
	Students With Disabilities	2/40%	1/17%	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17/24%	41/49%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/12%	15/47%	-
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/17%	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/52%	51/59%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/36%	16/46%	-
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/25%	-
	English Language Learners	1/25%	1/25%	-
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/27%	36/42%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/15%	11/32%	-
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	-
	English Language Learners	1/25%	2/50%	-
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63/82%	71/84%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/67%	28/78%	-
	Students With Disabilities	2/29%	4/44%	-
	English Language Learners	1/25%	3/75%	-

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	45	36		45	27		30				
ELL											
BLK	63			70							
HSP	59	30		54	60		45				
MUL	57			57							
WHT	83	70		84	69		82				
FRL	63	50	25	65	45	31	61				
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	34	47	46	42	53	46	5				
ELL	27	45		47	57						
BLK	33	42	36	48	47	40	7				

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	70	67	53	74	67	40	57				
MUL	48	63		61	75						
WHT	81	71	56	85	78	64	60				
FRL	60	62	47	65	65	46	38				
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	18	41	41	34	50	47	17				
ELL	30			58							
BLK	31	18		58	47						
HSP	66	60	27	69	72	64	52				
MUL	57	46		67	54						
WHT	70	54	43	86	78	52	63				
FRL	53	47	29	71	64	41	56				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	70
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	67
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	50
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	57
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	78
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
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?

FSA data from the 2020-21 school year indicates growth needed in math and reading learning gains for the lower 25% and science proficiency. Also, student subgroups of black and students with disabilities fell below 41% when combining all seven areas.

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

The areas which showed a decline was in learning gains for the lowest 25% in both ELA and Math.

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

Contributing factors include, the need for small group expertise in ELA & Math instruction, attention to the standards, and lack of basic skills to master tasks. There was a decline/irregularity in attendance due to Covid 19. Students were going back and forth from virtual education causing a gap in skills.

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

The Science area showed the most improvement based on progress monitoring and FCAT data.

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

Actions which contributed to 18% increase were developing/implementing a school-wide Science focus which included emphasis on grade level vocabulary, school news questions, PLCs in Science, common assessments, supplemental materials, following the Science core curriculum and the CCPS pacing guides more closely.

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

Focused learning for students with disabilities, lowest 25 percentile, and the black subgroup. Small group emphasis for these populations that include research based materials such as SIPPS and LLI to close learning gaps and accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities for teachers to accelerate the lowest 25% will include how to use a balanced literacy framework and the critical concepts along with using our new core curriculum

(Benchmark Advanced). This will be done through PLCs, data days, monthly focused grade level meetings, and school and district wide professional development days.

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

Programs such as Reading Recovery, SIPPS, and LLI will be used by well trained professionals. These programs will be monitored and data from these will be entered on a regular basis into EDIS.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SJE maintained a high percentage of achievement (3-5 FSA) and gains (2020-21 only 3rd to 5th due to no FSA in 2019-20). There was a significant loss of learning gains in the lowest 25% of students which is below the state level indicating a need for improvement. Support for these students is imperative for their continued success.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase our ELA learning gains of our lowest 25% of students from 28% to 41%.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored through our school based iReady diagnostic assessments, district Benchmark assessments, APM in ELA, and DIBELS assessments for our reading deficient students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SJE will be using collaborative planning, aligned standards, small group differentiating and other Marzano strategies to increase effectiveness of instruction. We will ensure a 90 minute uninterrupted Reading block which will include 60 minutes of Core instruction, 30 minutes of Tier II support and an additional 30 minutes of Tier III supports for identified reading deficient students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All students benefit from explicit direct best practices, but lower performing students will thrive in an environment that is differentiated and scaffolds for their needs. Small groups allow for intense instruction and additional attention to monitoring progress.

Action Steps to Implement	

Develop a master schedule which allows for departmentalization in grades 4-5, and teaming in grades K-3 and TAG in grades 1-5. This will allow teachers to become experts in their content area and specialize instruction for their small group instruction. This schedule also allows for additional support for the lowest 25% using ESE teachers to pull small groups of students to accelerate learning.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Gosser (rhonda.gosser@yourcharlotteschools.net)

School-wide systematic WIN plans were developed and will be implemented for our lowest 25% of students using LLI by Fountas and Pinnell and SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words) Benchmark Core Reading program, and Benchmark Remediation Kits. Scholastic Quick Reads are also used for small group instruction for Tier II students.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Monitor the use of WIN/iii activities for ELA by completing weekly walkthroughs. The Literacy Leadership team will meet monthly to discuss data collected by walkthroughs to synergize and collaborate and adjust WIN plans. These will include Explicit, Systematic and Intensive plans for instruction.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Gosser (rhonda.gosser@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Data Days will be facilitated three times this school year to allow for teams to deeply analyze data, determine student needs, and collaborate to develop future lesson plans for acceleration. These data days will be scheduled following each progress monitoring window. Teachers will meet formally in grade level teams in the mornings to analyze and review data. In the afternoons, differentiated professional learning

based on student performance and teacher need will be provided by one or more of the following: Curriculum and Instruction Specialist, Lead Teacher, or subject area champions.

Person Responsible Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Professional development in literacy instructional techniques and rigor of standards using Critical Concepts and Balanced Literacy Framework will be implemented to improve overall learning.

Person Responsible Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Prescriptive coaching will be provided by our Lead Teacher including one-on-one and small group coaching sessions. Modeled lessons and instructional rounds will also be provided for coaching opportunities.

Person Responsible Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teacher Support Team (TST) meetings will compare progress of struggling students with the class and steps can be made for more intensive intervention and acceleration. Monthly data support meetings will be held in conjunction with TST meetings to assist inputting information for tracking accountability in EDIS.

Person Responsible Shakira Thomas (shakira.thomas@yourcharlotteschools.net)

After each district-wide progress monitoring window, the district psychometrician shares data with each school so that decisions can be made on appropriate tiered interventions for students. This progress monitoring data is coupled with student performance on classroom formative assessments and teacher observation. Utilizing the data and the MTSS problem solving model, the identification of the component of instructions that requires acceleration are determined.

Person Responsible Doug Dunakey (doug.dunakey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SJE maintained a high percentage of achievement (3-5 FSA) and gains (2020-21 only 3rd to 5th due to no FSA in 2012-20). There was a significant loss of learning gains in the lowest 25% of students in the area of Math, which is below the state level indicating a need for improvement. Support for these students is imperative for their continued success.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase our Math learning gains of our lowest 25% of students from 33% to 45%.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored through our school based iReady Math diagnostic assessments (BOY, MOY, EOY), district Mastery Connect assessments (K-2), APM in Math (3-5), and common math assessments used in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Marzano strategies such as collaboration (during PLCs and PDs) and alignment of standards (during Data Days and coaching sessions) will be used to maintain current high levels of achievement but will also bolster engagement and retention for lower performing students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher knowledge and effectiveness is a critical component here so providing coaching, collaboration, PD days, and time to analyze student progress will help focus instruction. Focused instruction coupled with additional staff and supplemental support materials, create an environment that allows intense and individualized learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a master schedule which allows for departmentalization in grades 4-5, and teaming in grades K-3 and TAG in grades 1-5. This will allow teachers to become experts in their content area and specialize instruction for their small group instruction. This schedule also allows for additional support for the lowest 25% using ESE teachers to pull small groups of students to accelerate learning.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Gosser (rhonda.gosser@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Intervention materials (Do the Math) have been purchased to be utilized with students in need of acceleration (lowest 25%). A differentiated math fact fluency program, Reflex Math will be used in Grades 2-5 to strengthen fact fluency. In grades K-2, My Math Academy will be used to strengthen math concepts for our lowest 25%.

Person Responsible	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Data Days will be facilitated three times this school year to allow for teams to deeply analyze data, determine student needs, and collaborate to develop future lesson plans for acceleration. These data days will be scheduled following each progress monitoring window. Teachers will meet formally in grade level teams in the mornings to analyze and review data. In the afternoons, differentiated professional learning based on student performance and teacher need will be provided by one or more of the following: Curriculum and Instruction Specialist, Lead Teacher, or subject area champions.

Person Responsible	Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Professional development in literacy instructional techniques and rigor of standards using Critical Concepts and Balanced Literacy Framework will be implemented to improve overall learning.

Person Responsible   Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teacher Support Team (TST) meetings will compare progress of struggling students with the class and steps can be made for more intensive intervention and acceleration. Monthly data support meetings will be held in conjunction with TST meetings to assist inputting information for tracking accountability in EDIS.

Person Responsible   Shakira Thomas (shakira.thomas@yourcharlotteschools.net)

After each district-wide progress monitoring window, the district psychometrician shares data with each school so that decisions can be made on appropriate tiered interventions for students. This progress monitoring data is coupled with student performance on classroom formative assessments and teacher observation. Utilizing the data and the MTSS problem solving model, the identification of the component of instructions that requires acceleration are determined.

Person Responsible   Doug Dunakey (doug.dunakey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We are in TS&I status which means we must raise our achievement and learning gains of students in our Black Subgroup and our Students with Disabilities Subgroup. Both of these groups fell below the benchmark of 41%per our 2018-19 school data.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ESSA identified subgroups (Black and Students with disabilities) will increase to 45% in all areas as measured by the FSA and Science FCAT.
Monitoring:	Our subgroups will be monitored through the use of data chats, frequent progress monitoring, the MTSS process of collecting data to meet goals, and our monthly Child Talk meetings in which each grade level has the support of a core team member.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennie Hoke (jennie.hoke@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2018-19 school year, we were using a "pull out" program for ESE services. We are now providing ESE push-in services for both Math and ELA in addition to the Core instruction provided by highly qualified teachers. Additional supports like push-in services, intensive and targeted small groups, MTSS meetings, student mentoring and other resources will be available to support our lower performing students. The Leader in Me program will provide support in making goals and providing a positive learning atmosphere for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development and coaching will provide necessary skills to teachers to target these subgroups. Using the results from the BPIE assessment, ESSA tiered support for SWDs will be coordinated by BEESS within the current IDEA tiered support system. Use of a school-wide program that supports individual student needs, uses common language and monitors progress will allow students to thrive. The above strategies will help to level the playing field so all students can achieve more as evidenced by Stephen Covey and Marzano. Intervention/Acceleration programs (SIPPS, LLI, QuickReads, Do the Math) used to supplement the Core Curriculum have a .77 effect size on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted interventions are being utilized for identified subgroup students during the core reading block as well as in the Support time using strong and moderate materials such as Fountas and Pinnell LLI, SIPPS, Do the Math.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Gosser (rhonda.gosser@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teacher Support Team (TST) meetings will compare progress of struggling students with the class and steps can be made for more intensive intervention and acceleration. Monthly data support meetings will be held in conjunction with TST meetings to assist inputting information for tracking accountability in EDIS.

Person Responsible	Shakira Thomas (shakira.thomas@yourcharlotteschools.net)

District ESE leadership, FIN and FDLRS will schedule PD and technical assistance to school staff related to Inclusive education beliefs, student data and Inclusive scheduling (e.g. LRE calculations, staff allocations, service delivery models, ESE teacher and master schedules. Professional development and coaching will be provided to teachers to gain instructional techniques (ex. Leading/Lagging measures through Leader in Me coaching). Also, training will be given on how to use all intervention materials as well as making sure all necessary materials are in the hands of teachers and students.

Person Responsible Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Data Days will be facilitated three times this school year to allow for teams to deeply analyze data, determine student needs, and collaborate to develop future lesson plans for acceleration. These data days will be scheduled following each progress monitoring window. Teachers will meet formally in grade level teams in the mornings to analyze and review data. In the afternoons, differentiated professional learning based on student performance and teacher need will be provided by one or more of the following: Curriculum and Instruction Specialist, Lead Teacher, or subject area champions.

Person Responsible Tina Buscemi (tina.buscemi@yourcharlotteschools.net)

After each district-wide progress monitoring window, the district psychometrician shares data with each school so that decisions can be made on appropriate tiered interventions for students. This progress monitoring data is coupled with student performance on classroom formative assessments and teacher observation. Utilizing the data and the MTSS problem solving model, the identification of the component of instructions that requires acceleration are determined.

Person Responsible Doug Dunakey (doug.dunakey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

SJE discipline data shows no SESSR events other than 1 unstained Bully Incident for the 2020-21 school year which is extremely low compared to district and state data. We were not listed on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org dashboard. The Leader In Me program, which believes all students are leaders of their behavior and academics, and our PBIS plan establishes a positive school-wide culture. This year, our PBIS team has developed school wide positive expectations and students are rewarded. Behavior is also included in our MTSS system and monitored through monthly TST meetings.

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.

The Leader In Me program, which believes all students are leaders of their behavior and academics, and our PBIS plan establishes a positive school-wide culture. This year, our PBIS team has developed school wide positive expectations and students are rewarded. SJE plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by communicating needs and inviting them to be apart of the SJE family. SAC and PTO involvement will encourage a partnership as well as include families in school projects and decisions. Curriculum Nights, Academic Nights, Family Center Events, and fundraisers all contribute to this partnership bond.

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

Core Team - Made up of Admin, ESE Liaison, Guidance, Social Worker, Lead Teacher
Promotes monthly celebrations with staff to keep our school positive. Develops positive referrals and recognizes students for meeting goals, maintains Social Media Sites, Attends outside school events and organizes PBIS rewards such as incentives and Spirit Sticks

Lighthouse Leadership Team - Promotes the culture of leadership in our school and community. Is made up of action teams such as: Community Outreach, School Beautification,

Student Lighthouse Team - Made up of 4th/5th grade students. Works on actions teams to promote leadership throughout the school.

Parent Involvement Team - Works with our Family Associate to develop a Parent Engagement Plan for each school year.

School Advisory Council - Works with Administration to approve the yearly SIP Plan. Gives input on curriculum agendas.

Parent Teacher Organization - Made up of parents with representation from each grade level and administration
Established and oversees fundraising events, parent nights, staff appreciation and other approves funding to teacher projects.

Partnership Performance Team - Made up of teachers, union representative, and administration
Gives teachers a voice in working through issues which deal with curriculum and day to day operations of the school. Collaborates on master schedule, curriculum nights, SIP plan, etc.