Clay County Schools

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://sbj.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Mary Taylor

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://sbj.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taylor, Mary	Principal	Mrs. Taylor is the instructional leader of the school. She leads the staff as they disaggregate all data sources to identify areas of strength and opportunities to grow. She is responsible for the implementation of all state, district, and school initiatives.
Ruckersfeldt, Jordan	Math Coach	Mrs. Ruckersfeldt leads math interventions, assists with small group practices and data analyses for differentiation, and advances Eureka instruction and implementation of the new B.E.S.T. standards. Additionally, she serves as the Title I Lead.
Gleneski, Nancy	Reading Coach	Mrs. Gleneski is a Title I intervention teacher, as well as the Intervention Team Facilitator. She also leads our school's PBIS committee and serves as our school SAC Chair.
Chapman, Debbie	Assistant Principal	Mrs, Chapman is a school administrator responsible for supporting the principal in the instructional leadership of our school, as well as to the overall well-being and safety of the scholars and staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Mary Taylor

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

516

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	64	81	72	70	64	71	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	496
Attendance below 90 percent	21	16	19	14	16	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	11	9	3	5	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	3	4	1	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	12	30	22	40	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	7	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	3	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	63%	56%				58%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						52%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						49%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	51%	50%				63%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						57%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						37%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	69%	59%				63%	65%	53%

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**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	68%	-1%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	64%	-7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2022					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	63%	71%	-8%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
06	2022					
	2019	53%	70%	-17%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	62%	63%	-1%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	35	54	50	30	54	56	38				
ELL	31	50		13	50						
BLK	42	70	73	39	65	53	33				
HSP	49	59	40	53	67	75	46				
MUL	54	68		54	74						
WHT	59	62		55	71	60	77				
FRL	44	59	63	42	64	61	46				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33	22	9	42	43	45	38				
ELL	28			28							
BLK	38	39	27	36	36		33				
HSP	38	42		36	42		33				
MUL	23	30		42	30						
WHT	59	41		62	64		68				
FRL	36	36	18	41	51	50	35				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	39	48	43	50	47	29	41				
ELL	30	47		45	50		30				
BLK	41	45	45	56	49	27	41				
HSP	62	53		54	59	67	70				
MUL	50	42		64	58						
WHT	67	59	47	71	62	30	68				
FRL	52	51	56	60	52	35	62				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Historically, students across grade levels enter the school year at least one year below the expected proficiency level in both ELA and mathematics, and show growth throughout the year with the consistent teaching practices and small group instruction that are in place. For example, 2021-2022 iReady mathematics diagnostic 1 showed students at risk of tier 3 (students two or more grade levels below proficiency) at 20% and by diagnostic 3, gaps were closed significantly and only 9% remained at tier 3. Overall ELA and Math achievement increased, but still fell short of their 2019 pre-COVID proficiency rates. ELA increased from 45% to 51% with 2019 reporting at 58%. Math increased from 47% to 50% with 2019 reporting at 63%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off our first progress monitoring (22% proficiency) and state assessments (51% proficiency), vocabulary, identifying key details and main ideas, and comprehension of informational text are all areas of greatest need for students in ELA. In regards to mathematics, 2022 FSA assessments (50% proficiency), our first progress monitoring (8% proficiency), and iReady (16% proficiency) baseline data indicate that number sense and operations is the area of greatest need.

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

Students typically have limited access to books, are not frequently read to at home, have minimal background knowledge from exposure to events and experiences outside the home. This is due in large part to the lower socioeconomic demographics of our school population. Additionally, many of our families are uncomfortable with math concepts and experience math anxiety, and this carries over to our students.
To address these areas, we are monitoring instruction through classroom walkthroughs and ongoing data reviews. Professional learning communities are working to focus on essential standards and common formative assessments. The Title I ELA and Math coaches are providing support to instructional personnel with coaching cycles, model lessons, creating model classrooms, conducting data reviews, planning sessions, lunch and learn opportunities for professional development, and monitoring, supporting, and assisting with the implementation and fluidity of small group instruction.
Title I assistants provide support with small group instruction for both ELA and math. Various opportunities for professional development are provided for personnel with Lexia, Savvas, Achieve3000, i-Ready, ALEKS, and Studies Weekly, and with specific book studies that directly support classroom instruction.
Additionally, we have several home to school connections to encourage reading and mathematical literacy, such as a Little Library, a Literacy Night and Math Night, and reading and math strategies and activities are shared monthly for families in our newsletter to help families improve literacy skills and become more comfortable with mathematical concepts being taught at school.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Gaps in foundational skills and standards in both ELA and mathematics, such as phonemic awareness and place value understanding, significantly reduce throughout the year. Analysis of data indicates that students are showing progress, even if they are not at grade level proficiency. This is indicated in our increase in overall learning gains and learning gains of the bottom twenty-five percent. Overall ELA learning gains increased from 40% to 64%, and the bottom twenty-five percent increased from 22% to 60%. Overall mathematics learning gains increased from 48% to 68%, and the bottom twenty-five percent increased from 52% to 64%.

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

Factors that contributed to this improvement were the continued data-driven small group instruction and the implementation of tier 1 curriculum with fidelity. There was more consistency and structure in PLC work with teachers, as well as data meetings to track student progress. Students being accountable for their learning, understanding their performance data, and setting goals and monitoring their progress with their teacher also contributed to this improvement. These actions were taking place across all content areas and grade levels. A new action the school took in this area was the added support from the district literacy team to strategically target struggling learners.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are to continue to push for focused and structure PLC work and the continual analysis of student data to determine next steps. Continued use of small group instruction based on student data and implementation of tier 1 curriculum and supplemental programs with fidelity will also accelerate learning in all content areas. Additional strategies and personnel to support our ever-increasing ELL student population are also desperately needed.

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 that will be provided to support teachers and leaders include coaching cycles and planning sessions with instructional coaches, data dives, a dedicated meeting space for common team planning and PLCs, lunch and learns, and Google Classrooms for teacher use.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include retaining Title I instructional coaches and classroom assistants, recruiting and retaining qualified ELL assistants, and continuing to build upon the strong PLC foundation that is being established this school year.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	SBJ's area of focus in math will be increasing overall proficiency in Number Sense and Operations from 50% to 60%. SBJ's overall achievement on the 2022 FSA (50%) increased 3% from 2021; however, this achievement is still 13% below pre-COVID proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If students demonstrate understanding by representing problems in multiple ways, then SBJ scholars will improve their mastery of number sense and operations by 10% (from 50% to 60%) through their proficiency in solving rigorous math problems with multiple solutions and explain their thinking.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Area of Focus will be monitored for desired outcomes through ongoing data analysis of performance monitoring assessments, iReady and ALEKS diagnostics, and common formative assessments. This monitoring will indicate when shifts in instructional practice, small group instruction, and/or interventions and enrichment are needed. We expect proficiency in Number Sense and Operations to increase in each grade level, in each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented	Progress Monitoring Visual Representations Small Group Instruction

for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Exposing students to problems that are solved using multiple strategies enables students to become more efficient in selecting appropriate ways to solve math problems with greater ease and flexibility. Explaining relevant concepts and notation in the context of a problem-solving activity, prompting students to describe how worked examples are solved using mathematically valid explanations, and introducing algebraic notation systematically helps students develop new ways of reasoning, which will help them solve mathematical problems. Additionally, visual models allow students who have difficulty grasping the relationship between math representations and abstract symbols to understand this across math concepts and ideas.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction. To support small group instruction in classrooms, The Title I Intervention teacher leading data analysis and small group planning/interventions for math as well as model classroom/coaching cycles of best practice replication. Additionally, Title I classroom assistants will assist with providing small group instruction cycles in classrooms .

Person Responsible	Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

All teachers will implement modeling by having students use appropriate tools to create concrete visual representations as evident in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work analysis in PLCs. Additional manipulatives and notebooks for interactive note taking during whole group and small group instruction will assist with students learning to master mathematical concepts with visual representations.

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

Using chromebooks and headphones to support the technology based supplemental programs to our core instruction assist with quarterly progress monitoring.

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Research indicates that school attendance has a profound effect on student learning. The COVID-19 pandemic hit our school particularly hard, with chronic student absenteeism running rampant. In the 2021-2022 school year, SBJ had 117 students below 90 percent attendance; that is nearly one-fourth of our entire student population missing a significant amount of school. When students are not in school, not only are they missing grade-level instruction; they are missing vital small group instruction and interventions that would otherwise close learning gaps. In addition to absenteeism, many of our students do not have an adult who will advocate for them at home. School is the safe space for a large amount of our students, and the adults that they interact with at SBJ make them feel valued and cared for, which incentivizes them to come to school each day.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If all students have a teacher advocate established as a resource supporting the inclusive school community, then student engagement and daily attendance will increase by 13% (from 82% to 95%) campus-wide.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through quarterly attendance reports from Synergy. Teachers and administration will also be diligent in contacting families if student absences exceed three days.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Intentionally Build Effective Teacher-Student Relationships by ensuring each student has a faculty mentor to serve as a resource for support, encouragement, and accountability throughout the year. Define & Teach Positive Expectations Establish Positive Connections Foster Positive Relationships Schools and Families Have Meaningful Two-Way Communication
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/	Chronic absenteeism, or missing at least 15 days per school year, is increasingly common among students. In early grades, chronic absenteeism can predict high school dropout rates later on. Building rapport with students and establishing a school-based mentor can combat chronic absenteeism. Students are more motivated to attend classes if they know the teacher cares and will help them succeed. Even in elementary school, unexcused absences are linked to dropping grades, particularly in math. By motivating students to work hard and miss fewer lessons, teacher-student relationships can keep struggling students from falling behind and close the achievement gap.

criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Personal connection with students can also raise their intrinsic motivation to learn. When students feel interested in their work for the sake of mastering it, they develop a love of learning that benefits them for their entire lives.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

By implementing a new schoolwide token economy system to recognize and promote additional positive student interactions we will increase student attendance averages and simultaneously enhance our attendance, culture, engagement, and student proficiency levels.

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

We will track each student and have the faculty and staff assigned to students they have a personal connection with to ensure every child has an advocate. By ensuring each child has a personal connection with someone on campus this will enhance their school experience and make them more likely to attend by feeling a sense of belonging.

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

Provide continuous communication about attendance, behavior, and academic improvement strategies to students, families, and community members through after school events, fliers, mailers, social media posts, and digital publications through Smore, Canva and SmartSuite.

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

Schoolwide signs displaying consistent messaging.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on FSA data, SBJ increased its ELA achievement 6 percentage points from 45% in 2021 to 51% in 2022; however, this is still 7% below pre-COVID ELA achievement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If all teachers implement small group instruction to ensure specific student needs are met for proficiency in reading comprehension then we will see a 10% increase in learning gains, from 51% to 61%, in reading.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through progress monitoring assessments, Lexia Core5 and Lexia Power Up, Savvas assessments, Achieve 3000 level sets, and common formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	SBJ has chosen three strategies to amplify ELA instruction; an Evidence-based Program that adresses identified gaps aligned with the 5 components of reading (Lexia Core5), Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction, and Small Group Instruction. Lexia Core5 is a blended program that addresses identified gaps in all struggling learners. This will be monitored by Teacher and Administrator 5minute checks on a weekly basis, walkthroughs, observations, small group instruction, and data reviews. Explicit comprehension strategy instruction will be utilized to enhance literacy during small and whole group instruction. This will be monitored through checks for understanding (ie. Savvas vocabulary development, formative assessments, exit slips), online resources (Achieve or Lexia), walkthroughs and observations, data reviews, and diagnostic assessments. Small group instruction will be practiced to close instructional gaps and enrich student learning. This will be monitored through walkthroughs and observations, data analysis, and ongoing PLC work with common formative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	Lexia Core5 is an evidence based program addressing identified gaps in student learning, aligned with the 5 components of reading. The program allows for data driven differentiation closing individual literacy learning gaps and providing explicit instructional opportunities to teachers with

rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	lesson components that can be administered in a small group setting. Embedded assessment provides ongoing, actionable data for teachersto prioritize and plan offline instruction. Lexia Core 5 has a strong ESSA rating. Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction is another instructional practice we will implement.The rationale for the explicit teaching of comprehension skills is that comprehension can be improved by teaching students to use specific cognitive strategies or to reason strategically when they encounter barriers to understanding what they are reading. Providing focused, intensive,small group interventions for identified students at risk for reading deficiencies including the 5 core reading elements will close learning gaps and improve overall literacy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction & Title I classroom assistants will assist with providing small group instruction cycles in classrooms.

Person Responsible Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

All ELA teachers will explicitly teach reading strategies to students for before, during, and after reading such as how to activate background knowledge, generate questions, monitor their comprehension, identify the central idea, paraphrase, and summarize. There will be a book study on Comprehension, by Fisher, Frey, and Law to increase instructional practices that support comprehension. Additionally, the Title I ELA teacher will work with teachers for model classrooms/coaching cycles of best practice replication.

Person Responsible Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

Progress monitoring data will frequently be reviewed to direct instructional practices. These data meetings will be held either during the school day with substitutes covering classes, or after school hours for full collaboration.

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Only 31% of ELL students were at or above proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment. Additionally, ACCESS testing indicates 0% of our ELL students show language proficiency, as indicated by their overall composite scores of 0.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	35% of ELL students will show proficiency by the end of year FAST assessment raising proficiency levels by 4%. The Imagine Learning program targets language proficiency, and the ACCESS test assesses that language proficiency. With increased usage of Imagine Learning, we should definitely expect to see the percent of students increasing their overall composite scores from the previous year. ACCESS test scores and overall proficiency levels will rise 10%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom Walkthroughs Quarterly data dives Monthly Literacy Leadership Team data reviews Imagine Learning (weekly monitoring of usage) FAST
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Small group instruction provided with the assistance of ELL classroom assistants to target data indicated areas of need and increase proiciency. Professional development opportunities to facilitate and assist language immersion and learning provided by the distrct ESOL department and school. ELL dictionaries for scholars to access and utilize as they work towards fluency of language and content.

implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction. Small group instruction is a promising strategy. Collective efficacy provided through professional development is ranked as the number one factor influencing student achievement. Ensuring students know how to utilize ELL dictionaries are a way to explicitly teach vocabulary. The National Reading Panel (NRP) stated that vocabulary plays an important role both in learning to read and in comprehending text: readers cannot understand text without knowing what most of the words mean.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional development opportunities on best practices for working with ELL students and monitoring program usage of Imagine learning.

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

Weekly usage monitoring of the Imagine Learning program to ensure all students meet the 60 minutes per week requirement.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on end of year Lexia data;
Kindergarten was 0.2% below proficiency
1st grade was 8% below proficiency
2nd grade was 29.5% below proficiency

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on 2022 FSA data third grade had 33% of students performing below proficiency scoring a level 1 and level 2 in ELA.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on FAST data, at the beginning of the year 55.74% of our Kindergarten students were below proficiency and by end of year this will reduce to only 10% below proficiency. First grade beginning of the year FAST data indicated 48.98% were below proficiency and by end of year this will reduce to 5% below proficiency. Second grade beginning of the year FAST showed 59.26% were below proficiency and by end of year this will be reduced to 15% below proficiency

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on beginning of the year FAST data 91.43 % were below grade level proficiency and by end of year this will be reduced to 25% below proficiency.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Weekly PLCs
Quarterly data meetings
Classroom Walkthroughs
Lexia Core 5 and weekly data reviews
FAST

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

SRA Decoding and Comprehension are provided through direct explicit instruction as interventions to close instructional gaps.
Weekly PLCs to create common formative assessments, analyze student data, and refine instructional practices are consistent and collaborative.
Small group differentiated instruction based on individual student indicated needs closes gaps to leverage proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

PLCs improve instructional practices and leverage student achievement. Data reviews increase the effectiveness of small group and diferentiation practices to individualize student learning based upon need. Small group instruction provides focused, intensive interventions for identified students at risk for reading deficiencies to close learning gaps and elevate proficiency levels.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning and Assessment- Teachers are utilizing district ELA supports through weekly PLCs specifically focusing on creating common formative assessments for all ELA classrooms.	Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net
Literacy Leadership and Literacy Coaching- ELA teachers are provided professional development on the science of reading and specific county based interventions (such as SRA Decoding and Comprehension) that support direct, explicit, systematic instruction to leverage student learning outcomes.	Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

By implementing a new schoolwide token economy system to recognize and promote additional positive student interactions we will increase student attendance averages and simultaneously enhance our attendance, culture, engagement, and student proficiency levels. We will track each student and have the faculty and staff assigned to students they have a personal connection with to ensure every child has an advocate. By ensuring each child has a personal connection with someone on campus this will enhance their school experience and make them more likely to attend by feeling a sense of belonging. Provide continuous communication about attendance, behavior, and academic improvement strategies to students, families, and community members through after school events, fliers, mailers, social media posts, and digital publications through Smore, Canva and SmartSuite. Schoolwide signs displaying consistent messaging.

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

All faculty and staff consistently act as student advocates, build rapport to foster a safe learning environment, and consistently provide instruction and support to grow student life skills through our PBIS program. ,Parents support , collaborate, and encourage students with development of the monthly mindset and character traits. Students follow the PBIS excpectations and are engaged in school activities. Community partners and district support act as mentors, resources, and contribute to the on-going needs of our school community to ensure successful outcomes through the PBIS platform.