

Duval County Public Schools

Seabreeze Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

<http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze>

Demographics

Principal: Aimee Kimball

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (63%) 2018-19: A (70%) 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 Duval 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

<http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze>

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 KG-5	No	54%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

At Seabreeze Elementary, we aspire to build a foundation for lifelong learning by fostering individual growth. We provide unique opportunities for developing leadership skills, critical thinking, and creative expression. We want our Seahorses empowered, prepared and fulfilled.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seabreeze Elementary strives to provide a positive, engaging and thoughtful environment that will reach the whole child every day.

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
Kimball, Aimee	Principal	
Coffman, Carly	Assistant Principal	
Mercer, Erin	Instructional Coach	
Johnson, Karen	School Counselor	
Brewster, Natalie	SAC Member	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/10/2017, Aimee Kimball

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Total number of students enrolled at the school

511

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

8

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

6

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	72	93	83	98	86	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	0	33	23	26	28	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	21	23	30	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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	89	71	88	89	80	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	3	14	16	16	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	3	2	22	16	15	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	2	5	23	23	24	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	89	71	88	89	80	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	3	14	16	16	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	3	2	22	16	15	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	2	5	23	23	24	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	69%	50%	56%				75%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						72%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						61%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	48%	50%				79%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						78%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						64%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	59%	59%				64%	48%	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	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2022					
	2019	72%	50%	22%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

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	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	57%	20%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	49%	13%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

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	34	60	50	48	43	20	30				
BLK	23	55	57	26	48	40	15				
HSP	74	56		83	80						
MUL	50			58							
WHT	81	71	62	84	69		81				
FRL	52	58	56	52	52	52	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	34			48							
BLK	35	64		38	55		50				
HSP	81			81							
MUL	58			50							
WHT	79	71	45	84	75	55	75				
FRL	55	45		56	55	40	59				
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	40	69	63	44	72	71	29				
ELL											
BLK	52	65	60	55	77	82	31				
HSP	81	83		81	83						
MUL	86	80		79	70						
WHT	79	71	52	83	78	64	71				
FRL	62	70	70	66	77	70	47				

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	63
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	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
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	54
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	75
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	53
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?

Our core content areas have declined in proficiency since 2019. ELA fell from 75% to 69%, and Math has fallen from 79% to 73%. There are two concerning trends that have emerged among the African American and Students With Disabilities subgroups. ELA achievement was at 69%, yet our SWD were at 34% and AA students were at 23%. Math achievement was slightly higher at 73%, but our SWD were at 48% and AA students were at 26%.

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

The discrepancy between the SWD and AA subgroups compared to the larger population is evidenced in both ELA and Math. The need to close these achievement gaps is apparent, and can be readily monitored throughout the school year through a variety of assessment methods.

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

Covid-19, excessive absences, and inconsistent schooling experiences (virtual, homeschool, traditional) all serve as contributing factors as to why these students had different educational experiences. We need stronger, swifter attendance monitoring in place. Additionally, we are also focusing on problem solving practices and ensuring that tiered instruction is taking place with fidelity.

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

We were able to maintain our A grade, however, our proficiencies faced a decline. The data component with the most improvement was our ELA learning gains and BQ gains.

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

Our 5th grade students were especially successful in this area. New actions included looping the former 4th grade ELA teacher to 5th grade ELA.

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

Frequent monitoring and assessment, with a constant focus on closing achievement gaps among subgroups and greater population. Our action plan will identify students that will receive ESE and academic support. Our Leadership team will ensure that CPST and MTSS practices are followed, and that students in need get the proper intervention and support.

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.

Teachers will need increased professional development on reaching struggling learners, and will need increased opportunities for data analysis regarding subgroups. Our primary grades will need additional support, as it is their first year with state standardized assessments. All grade levels have new standards and/or new curriculum, with a variety of resources. It will be essential to involve study and exploration of these items during our professional development opportunities. We are allowing teachers to pursue professional development opportunities that directly correlate with their certification needs, specifically in the areas of ESE/SWD, Reading competencies, or Tier 3 interventions.

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

Seabreeze Elementary will utilize an evidence-based model of schooling that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. CPST and MTSS: Early identification, ongoing data collection and progress monitoring, purposeful implementation of academic intervention programs. This will be supported through handbooks, trainings, consistent meetings, and team support for classroom teachers, VE teachers, and struggling students. We will continue to utilize our attendance social worker team to reach out to families that are not attending school with regularity.

Objective 1: Increase teacher efficacy and knowledge of MTSS process for academics through training, use of MTSS handbook, and adherence to MTSS processes.

Person responsible: Admin, teachers, counselor, MTSS team

Objective 2: Increase student learning gains through data driven instruction, frequent progress monitoring, and data conversations among stakeholders.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This data was identified as an area that fell below the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students within our Black/AA subgroup will improve from 23% to 50% achievement in ELA and from 26% to 50% in Math within the 22-23 school year.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We will pull data by subgroup during state progress monitoring assessments. Additionally, we will lead teachers on how to pull this assessment on their classroom and district-level assessments to keep a watchful eye on any achievement gap. Pulling data will then lead to the creation of small groups, allowing the teacher to effectively intervene and reteach as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Lesson plans, small group intervention, data analysis sheets, assessment outcomes

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Data supports instructional decision making, and justifies the related services provided to identified students in need.

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.

Collect and monitor lesson plans with fidelity

Person Responsible Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

Data-driven intervention groups to determine small group instruction- created through common planning, with assistance of coach and school Leadership team

Person Responsible Erin Mercer (mercere@duvalschools.org)

Monitoring and completion of CPST/MTSS process for identified/at risk students

Person Responsible Karen Johnson (johnsonk13@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our students with disabilities performed at 34% in ELA, compared to 69% total achievement rates. Additionally, students with disabilities performed at 48% in Math, compared to 73% of the total achievement percentage.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Seabreeze Elementary plans to close this achievement gap by at least ten percent per each subject area, with a minimum expected percentage of 50%. This would create a goal of sixteen percentage points for ELA achievement in SWD, and a goal of 58% for Math achievement.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We will pull data by subgroup during state progress monitoring assessments. Additionally, we will lead teachers on how to pull this assessment on their classroom and district-level assessments to keep a watchful eye on any achievement gap. Pulling data will then lead to the creation of small groups, allowing the teacher to effectively intervene and reteach as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Lesson plans, data analysis, classroom assessment data, VE/ESE services log, increased fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, CPST and MTSS agendas and outcomes

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Data supports instructional decision making, and justifies the related services provided to identified students in need. We also under-identified and infrequently served at-risk students, according to the MTSS/CPST procedures in place. Those will continued to be reviewed, monitored, and utilized appropriately.

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.

Collect and monitor lesson plans with fidelity

Person Responsible Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

Data driven intervention groups to determine small group instruction- created through common planning and assistance of coach and school Leadership team

Person Responsible Erin Mercer (mercere@duvalschools.org)

Monitoring and completion of CPST/MTSS process for identified/at-risk students

Person Responsible Karen Johnson (johnsonk13@duvalschools.org)

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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

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.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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**

N/A

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.

Seabreeze will implement Calm Classroom, Wellness Wednesday, and Tier 1 PBIS plans, as well as behavior supports and interventions to result in student learning outcomes.

Children will be able to articulate and use strategies for self control and to regulate their emotions.

Teachers will use conflict resolution strategies and instruction to teach children how to regulate negative emotions and communicate their needs to peers and teachers.

Our school PBIS team will celebrate and reward model behavior through cafeteria management, positive referrals, Character Counts, and Seahorse celebrations.

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

Students
Families
Teachers & Staff
Volunteers
Community Support

All will work together to recognize and celebrate one another's accomplishments. We will promote positive behavior through instruction, praise, motivation, and rewards.