

Martin County School District

Jensen Beach 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	27

Jensen Beach Elementary School

2525 NE SAVANNAH RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

martinschools.org/o/jbe

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Radcliff

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2019

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Jensen Beach Elementary School

2525 NE SAVANNAH RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

martinschools.org/o/jbe

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	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Jensen Beach Elementary strives to foster a nurturing and safe school community. We provide a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success, allowing for individual differences and learning styles. We have a school-wide focus on urgency, importance, and teamwork. Parents, teachers, and community members are actively involved in our students' academic and social-emotional learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educate all students for success in a global society.

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
Michels, Jennifer	Principal	
Law, Jamie	Assistant Principal	
Lunt, Alice	Other	
Joie, Jade	School Counselor	
Foohs, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	
Baumgartner, Cherie	Instructional Media	
Boudreau, Jill Ann	Teacher, K-12	
McIntyre, Kari	Teacher, K-12	
Moen, Karin	Teacher, K-12	
Farriss, Marybeth	Teacher, K-12	
McConnell, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 2/1/2019, Jennifer Radcliff

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.*

5

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

557

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.

7

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	93	97	98	103	118	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	20	14	13	10	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	5	1	9	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	1	4	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	13	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	2	3	1	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

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	78	81	89	91	104	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	7	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	78	81	89	91	104	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	7	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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				66%	58%	57%	66%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	59%	58%	63%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	56%	53%	49%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	65%	63%	68%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	65%	62%	73%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	53%	51%	55%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				64%	58%	53%	67%	59%	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	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	58%	7%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	67%	1%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	63%	53%	10%	53%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReay Diagnostic
Science PMT

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43.42	62.55	80.34
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.00	51.04	70.37
	Students With Disabilities	37.10	53.33	72.73
	English Language Learners	9.52	19.05	40.00
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26.32	55.51	80.17
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.90	44.68	71.89
	Students With Disabilities	30.89	55.93	74.79
	English Language Learners	10.00	35.00	52.63

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44.55	59.80	77.94
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.24	50.00	68.48
	Students With Disabilities	39.05	46.15	67.96
	English Language Learners	9.52	14.29	30.00
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25.30	53.37	77.78
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.30	53.37	77.76
	Students With Disabilities	33.65	50.00	73.27
	English Language Learners	10.00	26.32	36.84
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46.33	61.25	76.22
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.56	52.98	64.19
	Students With Disabilities	36.90	45.12	65.43
	English Language Learners	15.79	26.32	36.84
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26.63	54.00	78.16
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.08	40.00	66.67
	Students With Disabilities	36.14	50.62	73.75
	English Language Learners	22.22	41.18	50.00

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46.85	59.57	75.00
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.65	55.65	65.57
	Students With Disabilities	41.67	48.28	64.41
	English Language Learners	13.33	35.71	42.86
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28.07	52.84	76.98
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.60	38.71	69.17
	Students With Disabilities	49.15	52.63	71.93
	English Language Learners	21.43	38.46	61.54
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44.00	59.30	72.25
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.74	54.55	59.74
	Students With Disabilities	35.90	44.74	57.89
	English Language Learners	18.18	50.00	60.00
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35.06	55.56	73.10
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.57	40.79	62.67
	Students With Disabilities	27.59	34.48	27.59
	English Language Learners	30.00	44.44	66.67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	38.89	52.78	38.89
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.59	34.48	27.59
	Students With Disabilities	38.89	56.25	38.89
	English Language Learners	33.33	33.33	33.33

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	43	38		49	25		47				
ELL	50			33							
HSP	57			57							
WHT	72	68	57	72	46	43	73				
FRL	61	63		54	26	46	53				
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	46	43	40	49	53	33	58				
ELL	43	54		54	42						
HSP	62	65		64	58						
WHT	69	57	49	71	58	38	63				
FRL	50	50	42	49	51	30	50				
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	52	57	44	60	68	60	61				
ELL	38			62							
BLK	54	60		50	60						
HSP	66	83		53	70		67				
MUL	60										
WHT	67	59	41	73	74	59	68				
FRL	57	59	43	60	72	54	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	60
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	62
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	51
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?

We are achieving growth in student proficiency and learning gains in all areas with the exception of math learning gains.

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

Consistent decline in math learning gains and gains for students with disabilities.

Math Learning Gains decreased from 55 to 45.

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

Math Learning Gains

Contributing Factors: Global pandemic forced all schools to remote learning and then to blended learning platforms. This was a new way of teaching and learning for teachers and students. Rigorous logistical restrictions resulted in less hands-on activities and far less use of math manipulatives and projects.

New Actions Needed: Return to cooperative learning structures and hands-on math manipulatives. Renewed focus on full intention and rigor of math standards K-5.

Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities:

Contributing Factors: Staff turn over. Several experienced and well trained teachers have moved on over the past few years. Different student cohort with greater behavioral and emotional needs and require greater cognitive support. Transition to remote learning less effective for these students. Loss of allocations resulting in less ESE support. Trend towards more students struggling with language development due to language impairment. Loss of experienced and trained ESE teachers in existing language intervention programs.

New Actions Needed: Renewed fidelity of visual schedules and sensory lab visits as proactive measures to support student success. Training for new ESE teachers in research based curriculum and best practices. Implementation of research based curriculum with fidelity. Increased support of behavioral needs. Staff to fill vacant ESE paraprofessional positions.

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

ELA Learning Gains increased from 56 to 70.
ELA Learning Gains by the lowest quartile increased from 48 to 59.

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

In depth focus on intentional planning, unwrapping standards, and backwards design. Planning lessons and activities directly aligned to standards. Incorporating pre-planned monitoring questions. Grade level CLTs meeting consistently every Tuesday and Thursday for intentional planning. Giving teams extended periods of time each month for intentional planning.

Implemented Thinking Maps school-wide. PTA purchased materials for all teachers. Bi-weekly Professional development sessions throughout the year combined with classroom implementation support. Integrated across all content areas and all grade levels. Peer coaching and explicit Look Fors.

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

PD for the newly adopted Benchmark ELA curriculum.
Scheduled fidelity checks with the entire leadership team for ELA interventions.
Continued monitoring of intentional planning through lesson plans and learning walks.
Continued focus on differentiated instruction within the core.

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.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) established to support teachers with the implementation of new ELA Curriculum. LLT attended summer training institute. Optional train-the-trainer PD offered on Saturday October 2nd. LLT members and admin will attend.

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

Continued walk throughs and classroom visits with actionable feedback. LLT meets monthly to analyze data, share teacher perspectives, best practices, and brainstorm ways to overcome challenges.

School Improvement Goals:
Systemic Excellence
Positive Culture
High Levels of learning for All

Focus:
Urgency
Importance
Teamwork

Monthly new teacher meetings to support increased number of new teachers to JBE.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We will continue to accelerate student learning gains through a renewed focus on the PLC process. We've termed this our "JBE PLC Reboot" this year. We experienced increase in all areas of school grade calculation with the exception of math learning gains. This renewed focus on our overarching school-wide Professional Learning Community and the supporting grade level Collaborative Learning Teams includes structure through timed agendas and assessment/ data analysis calendars with the expectation that student data is analyzed as a reflection of the teacher's instructional practice. Teachers collaborate to share instructional strategies that are achieving better outcomes for students.

Measurable Outcome:

Our goal is to increase Math and ELA learning gains by 5 percent.
Increase Math to 48 / Increase ELA to 73
Our goal is for each class to also increase learning gains by 5 percent.

Historic ELA Learning Gains:

2021 70
2019 59
2018 68

Historic Math Learning Gains:

2021 45
2019 55
2018 73

Monitoring:

The work of our CLTs is heavily supported by our Guiding Coalition. The Guiding Coalition meets bi-weekly with the principal to review data and set expectations and model CLT sessions. The work is monitored through principal and assistant principal involvement in CLT sessions as well as CLT agendas that are shared in advance and completed in real time during each CLT session.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Learning Communities

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

School leaders participated in a 3 day summer training PLC Institute. Resources used include:
MCSD PLC Toolkit
Solution Tree - variety of PLC books and resources
Teacher Teamwork (ASCD), by Margaret Searle and Marilyn Swartz
Guiding Coalition has engaged in PD provided by the principal and school district professional development department

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate Guiding Coalition sessions bi-weekly.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Support and monitor CLT sessions through attendance by school administrators and school counselor/ aspiring leader and reviewing agendas and minutes on the Google drive. Respond to questions and provide additional support. Grade level CLTs meet Tuesdays and Thursdays after school 2:10-2:50.

Person Responsible Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus	Student proficiency in ELA is 68%. We have a school-wide sense of urgency to increase proficiency through student agency, even in the midst of the barriers encountered these past two years with a global pandemic.
Description and Rationale:	Our goal is to increase student proficiency in ELA by 5 percent to 72. Our goal is for each class also to increase ELA proficiency by 5 percent.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Historic ELA Achievement:</p> <p>2021 68</p> <p>2019 66</p> <p>2018 66</p> <p>Our Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) meets monthly with the principal to review literacy data, share best practices, and monitor implementation of our newly adopted ELA curriculum.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Teachers on the Literacy Leadership Team conduct four informal peer-to-peer walk throughs each month. They record observations in a notebook and share noticings and wonderings at the LLT monthly meetings.</p> <p>The principal and assistant principal conduct classroom walk throughs utilizing the MCSD Literacy Walk Through Document. This more formalized document monitors implementation of the new curriculum and support needed for specific teachers. This data is also shared at the monthly LLT meetings.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum implemented with fidelity.</p> <p>School leaders receive training from Benchmark on assessment reports and data analysis. LLT and school admin attend train-the-trainer PD from Benchmark.</p> <p>Timely, specific, actionable, and ongoing feedback to teachers combined with support from colleagues and admin.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Collective Efficacy</p> <p>Specific, actionable feedback is a high effect strategy for improving outcomes.</p> <p>A systemic guaranteed and viable curriculum is a prerequisite for increasing student achievement.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate monthly meetings with the Literacy Leadership Team to review walk through observations and data collected and to plan next steps for implementation fidelity and support.

Person Responsible Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Systematically conduct walk throughs sharing on the spot feedback to teachers while also collecting data to be further analyzed for differentiated PD and support.

Person Responsible Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Learning gains for students in the lowest quartile in reading 59 and math 42.

Our goal is to increase learning gains by students in the lowest quartile in both reading and math by 5 percent. Math increase to 44 / Reading increase to 62.
Our goal is for each class to also increase learning gains by students in the lowest quartile by 5 percent.

Measurable Outcome:

Historic ELA Learning Gains by Lowest Quartile:

2021 59

2019 48

2018 49

Historic Math Learning Gains by Lowest Quartile:

2021 42

2019 37

2018 55

Monitoring:

Principal and Assistant Principal attend CLTs to support data analysis and intentional planning. CLT agendas are also reviewed and follow-up support provided.
Lesson plans are reviewed for evidence of pre-planned differentiated learning activities and monitoring questions aligned to the rigor of the standards. Feedback is provided through individual teacher conferences and the evaluation process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Backward Design
Intentional Planning
Differentiated Learning Activities
Thinking Maps

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This is the third year of our school-wide focus on intentional planning. Focus on using student data to develop pre-planned differentiated learning activities is the natural evolution of our intentional planning goal. Teachers are well versed in the expectation and process of backward design and our collective commitment to achieving high levels of learning for all.

This is our second year of implementing Thinking Maps school-wide. Teachers have worked to align maps to the BEST standards across all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Review lesson plans and walk through classrooms to observe pre-planned differentiated learning activities in action.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Work with CLTs to support data analysis and intentional planning process.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Learning Walks focused on Thinking Maps school-wide Look Fors that were developed in collaboration with all teacher teams. Continue PD focused on using Thinking Maps to differentiate instruction and empower all students to achieve the full rigor of the standards.

Person Responsible Jennifer Michels (michelj@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning gains of our students with disabilities have steadily declined since 2018. Staff turnover and loss of ESE allocations have contributed to this decline. Our goal this year is to focus on what we can control which is our instruction in the classroom.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is for learning gains by students with disabilities to increase by 5 percent in reading to 47.
Our goal is for each class to also increase reading learning gains by students in the lowest quartile by 5 percent.

Historic ELA Learning Gains by students with disabilities:
2019 43
2018 57

Monitoring: Lesson plans and classroom observations of our self-contained VE classes as well as our Support Facilitated general education classes.
Sensory Lab schedule and visits.
Ensure visual schedules are implemented as intended and differentiated for age/need of student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Research based multi-sensory curriculum:
Sound Sensible
SPIRE
Foundations
Benchmark

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our ESE teachers have now been trained in these research based programs and are able to implement with students as appropriate.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training for ESE teachers and follow up with differentiated support.

Person Responsible Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Monitor lesson plans and conduct classroom walk throughs to monitor fidelity of implementation of research based curricula, sensory lab, and visual schedules.

Person Responsible Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)

ESE CLT sessions to specifically support ESE teachers who face unique situations and daily challenges.

Person Responsible Alice Lunt (lunta@martin.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our data shows a need to continue our recent increase in science proficiency. Prior to last year our science proficiency was declining.

Our goal is to increase science proficiency by 5 percent to 73.
Our goal is also for every class to increase science proficiency by 5 percent.

Measurable Outcome: Historic Science Proficiency:
2021 69
2019 64
2018 67

Monitoring: Our goal to increase science proficiency will be monitored through lesson plans and classroom visits as well as science lab teacher and admin support during CLT sessions. Student performance outcomes will be monitored through quarterly science Benchmark assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Intentional Planning
PLC process in Collaborative Learning Teams
Coaching by science lab teacher and district science coordinator

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These research based strategies are proven to develop teachers, align lessons to full rigor of standards, identify misconceptions, and promote increased student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Science lab teacher will meet with grade level teams monthly to support science planning and progress monitoring of student performance data.

Person Responsible Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)

District science coordinator and instructional coach will meet quarterly with grade level teams to support collaborative planning, resource alignment, and hands-on experiments.

Person Responsible Jamie Law (lawj@martin.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.

According to the data, Jensen Beach Elementary falls into the low range for violent incidents ranking #414 out of 1395. Out-of-School Suspensions decreased from 27 to 25. An area of concern is the increase of In-School Suspensions from 0 to 16. Incidents that result in suspensions can lead to a breakdown in school culture.

When student's exhibit behaviors that are not appropriate for the school environment relationships suffer. The relationship is damaged between the person who caused the harm, the recipient of the harm, and the community in which the harm was felt. . By using the 5 R's of Restorative Practices: relationship, respect, responsibility, repair, and reintegration we will monitor the number of referrals, suspensions, and repeat offenses after restorative practices are implemented.

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.

Through combined support of our PTA and SAC, JBE is in the process of becoming an Energy Bus Certified School. We have a multi-layered plan to accomplish our school improvement goal of positive culture.

We facilitated a summer book study for staff and interested PTA and SAC members focused on The Energy Bus, by Jon Gordon. Staff members shared video reflections throughout the summer. Our message being we must focus on what we can control, adult behavior, and that we are the driver of our own bus and must take responsibility for our own thoughts, words, actions, and attitudes. Just as importantly, we must help each other extinguish negative talk and toxic energy and not tolerate it from others. We are in control of the adult behavior we allow at our school and in our life.

We launched the school year with a half day professional development for all teachers and school staff. Additionally, all teachers received the read aloud book Energy Bus for Kids as well as Classroom Activity Guides that include monthly activities to be done in classrooms. The monthly themed activities relate directly back to the read aloud book and Energy Bus principles.

Our leadership team attends monthly coaching sessions via Zoom with Jon Gordon and his team along with

school leaders across the country to share successes, best practices, and challenges. Our leadership team also has a Campus Activities Guide with Energy Bus rules and reminders to be incorporated into daily announcements, school assemblies, parent events, social media posts, and messages/newsletters to families. We include Energy Bus updates in our monthly PTA and SAC meetings so that parent and community stakeholders are involved in the process as well.

Energy Bus principles are reviewed during monthly faculty meetings. Our Sunshine Committee plans teambuilding challenges for the start of every faculty meeting followed by a restorative circle debrief and sharing best practices.

We have incorporated Energy Bus leadership recognition for students and staff members. Staff members nominate colleagues to be recognized as our school employee of the month. Nominations are accompanied by examples of implementing the Energy Bus Principles. One student from each class is recognized as an Energy Bus Leader on campus and gets to participate in the monthly Energy Bus Leadership Luncheon on the stage in the cafeteria.

We will implement a Principal Leadership Academy with 4th and 5th grade students. Students will be nominated by teachers and will meet monthly with the principal to share student perspective and feedback on our Energy Bus initiatives and to plan student celebrations and ideas for parent communication.

We have a focus on renewed personal connections this year. We start every meeting with a restorative circle prompt in an effort to foster relationship building. Teachers also incorporate restorative circles with students in their classrooms.

Through our PTA and SAC we also have a renewed energy around school spirit. Our PTA spirit team designed new t-shirts for students, staff, and parents. They also created spirit sticks that grade levels will win during student celebration assemblies. The winning classes get to decorate the spirit stick and proudly carry it with them for the month. Our School Advisory Council closely monitors our school improvement goals of Systemic Excellence, Positive Culture, and High Levels of Learning for All. Our SAC analyzes survey data collected from students, staff, and parents to monitor our progress towards our goals and to adjust plans as needed.

In order to support new teachers, monthly mentoring meetings are held to provide timely support. The intention is to build relationships between resident teachers and new staff members. The timely information will help provide support and eliminate overwhelm when trying to complete time-sensitive tasks such as grades, conferences, deliberate practice, lesson plans, etc. JBE is the place to be and the goal is to retain experienced and highly trained educators.

The PBIS Committee has a renewed focus on parent and community partnerships. A newly created PTA Liaison position has been added to facilitate communication between school and families. The PTA also funded \$2,500 this year for monthly student incentives to recognize students who are showing school-wide expectations: Just Be Safe, Be Responsible, Everyone's Respectful. Following the school-wide expectations creates a positive school environment.

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

School leadership team - Consistently and transparently share the school vision, mission, and school goals with all stakeholders. Implement campus-wide Energy Bus initiatives each month.

School teachers and staff - Implement the Classroom Activities Guide to keep Energy Bus principles alive each month. Focus on collective efficacy.

Students - Focus on student agency and sharing new learning with other students and families.

PTA President and SAC chair - Work collaboratively to share initiatives and feedback between families, community members, and school staff.

PBIS Committee - Recognizing students and teachers for displaying school-wide expectations and Energy Bus Principles. Reviewing data to design interventions to address student behaviors and to support restorative practices.

Families and Community Partners - Open communication and collaboration to support, share, and celebrate positive culture of the school and the community.

Volunteers - We have a very large volunteer community that ranges from middle school and high school students to retired educators. Volunteers are integral part of our positive school culture as well.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00