

Clay County Schools

Lake Asbury Junior High 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

Lake Asbury Junior High School

2851 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://laj.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Lydia Creel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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)	43%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (67%)
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

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

Lake Asbury Junior High School

2851 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://laj.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)
Middle School 7-8	No	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant, and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
McConnell, Mallory	Principal	Analyzes data and works with team to develop goals for school based on historical academic and social emotional learning progress
Umbaugh, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Analyzes data and works with team to develop goals for school based on historical academic and social emotional learning progress
Brashear, Arlie	SAC Member	Works as a self contained PBIS teacher, as well as a SAC committee member that helps to SAC team understand school progress
Lanoux, Kimberly	Instructional Media	As the media specialist works to ensure that all campus stakeholders are involved
Roache, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	As a math teacher works to help analyze data and develop goals for student achievement
Smith, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	As and ESE teacher, and school MTSS coordinator, works to be sure that students receive supports to meet goals and high expectations as set in the SIP

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Lydia Creel

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

82

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,035

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

20

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

20

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	489	547	0	0	0	0	1036
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	137	0	0	0	0	247
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	84	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	35	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	112	0	0	0	0	164
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	127	0	0	0	0	210

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	54	96	0	0	0	0	150

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/15/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530	564	0	0	0	0	1094
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	25	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	100	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	65	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	50	0	0	0	0	126
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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

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	15	15	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530	564	0	0	0	0	1094
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	25	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	100	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	65	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	50	0	0	0	0	126
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	125	0	0	0	0	225
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	55%	56%	50%				65%	61%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						60%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						47%	49%	47%
Math Achievement	70%	33%	36%				67%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	64%						53%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						43%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	64%	53%				73%	66%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	59%	58%				84%	81%	72%

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
07	2022					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	52%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019	66%	63%	3%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	38%	49%	-11%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	72%	64%	8%	48%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	84%	80%	4%	71%	13%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	65%	27%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	64%	30%	57%	37%

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	26	32	27	42	49	37	34	62	50		
ELL	30	40	45	70	75		25	58			
ASN	67	63		83	69				100		
BLK	45	44	27	58	64	56	48	88	70		
HSP	44	39	34	67	58	53	48	68	76		
MUL	63	52		66	62	47	52	76	64		
WHT	58	48	32	73	65	52	65	86	69		
FRL	46	43	29	61	61	55	52	81	61		
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	35	40	35	43	47	39	39	59	45		
ELL	19	48	53	40	71	73	27				
ASN	85	85		92	77		90		94		
BLK	47	53	47	50	42	36	50	71	62		
HSP	51	55	46	61	52	59	53	78	68		
MUL	71	55		61	44		65	100	73		
WHT	61	57	34	68	53	54	69	81	71		
FRL	47	50	41	54	48	49	54	72	54		
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	32	47	39	35	41	29	43	55	60		
ELL	31	47	50	38	38						

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
ASN	91	87		87	52		92	100	88		
BLK	54	52	44	54	44	32	51	80	79		
HSP	55	58	50	58	54	57	65	80	76		
MUL	63	63	45	67	53	38	64	89	65		
WHT	67	61	45	69	53	43	76	84	78		
FRL	55	56	41	57	49	39	67	78	70		

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	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	54
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	60
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	61
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?

Students in our Civics classes continue to outperform many of the other schools in our county, as well as comparable schools across the state. Our Geometry and Algebra I students also show growth throughout the school year as evidenced by their EOC scores. Our 8th grade ELA students were trending lower than our 7th grade students, yet only showing behind one of our other schools in the district. We also noticed that our 8th grade Science scores were trending lower than previous years.

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

8th grade ELA and 8th grade Science show the greatest need for improvement

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

In 2022 our state adopted new standards and curriculum that was used, but the state still continued to test our students using the FSA. Teachers were learning the new standards and materials as well as preparing students to take their FSA tests.

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

7th and 8th grade Math

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

Teachers began using data in a more intentional way to support students and provide support in small group as needed in order to help close gaps, continue momentum and challenge students.

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

Teachers will continue to track student data on common formative assessments and dive into their data in PLCs in order to be sure they are best meeting student need.

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 work closely with district coaches and specialists in order to stack standards and reinforce prior learning and connect to future learning. In addition teachers will be provided ongoing professional development that will include: communicating learning targets and success criteria to students as well as designing common assessments in order to progress monitor and support students as needed.

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

Teachers will be expecting students to track their own data. This will involve teaching students what the numbers/data means, individual goal setting, and monitoring their own progress toward goals.

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 ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Lake Asbury Junior High school has selected the above focus to directly impact the academic performance of our students. We believe by focusing on the following components Tier 1 instruction will continue to strengthen: grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations we will provide our students high quality instructional and academic experiences to directly grow their academic performance and outcomes.

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

Measurable

Outcome:

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

FAST ELA scores will improve through progress monitoring by 20% (PM1 to PM2 and PM2 to PM3)

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will be expected to strengthen their practice through targeted PLC groups that continuously cycle to answer the following questions: what do we want students to know and be able to do, how will we know if they "get it", what do we do for students who struggle with it, and what will we do for students who already know it.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Monthly professional development sessions targeting these high quality instructional priorities.
2. Supported planning time through professional learning communities addressing standards aligned instruction and assignments.
3. Targeted feedback from school administration through walkthroughs related to the monthly instructional priority.
4. Instructional coaching cycles with district coaches and specialists

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1. Delivering professional development sessions targeting these high quality instructional priorities will allow a systemic campus-wide vision for what these academic experiences should look like.
2. Supported planning will be paramount to strengthening instructional practices and reviewing the work expected from students.
3. Targeted feedback from walkthroughs will allow teachers the opportunities to continue instructional practices that are effectively impacting students or address any deficiencies in content delivery.
4. Instructional Coaching Cycles related to instructional priorities will be offered as an additional support as needed if school-based administration determines there are any deficiencies in content delivery.

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.

1. Implement a plan and deliver monthly professional development related to the four instructional priorities (grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations).

2. Attend and support weekly professional learning communities (PLC).
3. Monitor and support classroom learning through weekly walkthroughs.
4. Identify staff members to participate in instructional coaching cycles and support through the scope and sequence cycle as needed.

Person Responsible Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

#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.

Lake Asbury Junior High school has selected the above focus to directly impact the academic performance of our students. We believe by focusing on the following components Tier 1 instruction will continue to strengthen: grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations we will provide our students high quality instructional and academic experiences to directly grow their academic performance and outcomes

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

FAST Math scores for our SWD subgroup will improve through progress monitoring by 20% (PM1 to PM2 and PM2 to PM3)

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will be expected to provide small group instruction in their Math classes in order to meet student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Monthly professional development sessions targeting these high quality instructional priorities.
2. Supported planning time through professional learning communities addressing standards aligned instruction and assignments.
3. Targeted feedback from school administration through walkthroughs related to the monthly instructional priority.
4. Instructional coaching cycles with district coaches and specialists

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1. Delivering professional development sessions targeting these high quality instructional priorities will allow a systemic campus-wide vision for what these academic experiences should look like.
2. Supported planning will be paramount to strengthening instructional practices and reviewing the work expected from students.
3. Targeted feedback from walkthroughs will allow teachers the opportunities to continue instructional practices that are effectively impacting students or address any deficiencies in content delivery.
4. Instructional Coaching Cycles related to instructional priorities will be offered as an additional support as needed if school-based administration determines there are any deficiencies in content delivery.

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.

1. Implement a plan and deliver monthly professional development related to the four instructional priorities (grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations).

2. Attend and support weekly professional learning communities (PLC).
3. Monitor and support classroom learning through weekly walkthroughs.
4. Identify staff members to participate in instructional coaching cycles and support through the scope and sequence cycle as needed.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS

Area of Focus Description and

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

Between August 10th and September 23rd, 2021 our school had processed 127 discipline referrals.

Not only were there minor incidents, such as tardies and dress code violations, but also for disrespectful or defiant behavior on campus.

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

For the same date range (August 10th-September 23rd, 2022) we have only processed 77 discipline referrals. We plan to continue to lower the discipline referral rate on campus.

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

We will pull a report from Synergy monthly in order to monitor number of discipline referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Umbaugh (jennifer.umbaugh@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

We are using our ROAR student guidelines (Respectful actions and words, Only safe behaviors, Always do your best and Responsible choices), as in the past, but have gotten more specific. We realized that Respectful actions and words needed to be drilled down so that all students are on the same page. We now remind them in the announcements, in class and posted all over campus that Respectful actions and words means: Respectful Language, Respectful to Adults and Peers, Respectful of Attendance and Tardy Policy, Respectful of Dress Code Policy and Respectful of Learning Environment. We took the time at the beginning of the year to discuss these, as school administrators, in class

implemented for this Area of Focus.

meetings for deeper understanding. In addition we use our Tiger Token system to highlight desired behaviors in students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We met with teachers to get feedback at the end of last school year. We developed these more specific ROAR criteria in response to some of the biggest obstacles that teachers see in the classroom and on campus.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

We will have monthly PBIS/Foundations meetings to review data and discuss concerns.

Person

Responsible

Mallory McConnell (mallory.mcconnell@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.

Lake Asbury Junior High has a variety of ways to build positive relationships with families and the community to increase involvement and our school culture. Teachers send home positive postcards to families monthly, as well as make positive phone calls home to families. Teachers and administrators are readily accessible through conferences, email, Facebook, and classroom websites. Our communication plan is using phone calls home, social media, and our school website to inform and document events happening within the school. We listen to families and invite them to share ideas through surveys and the School Advisory Council. Parents can check their child's progress at anytime by logging into the Synergy Parent Vue.

Even with all these ways to communicate, it is important to use our community as an additional way to bring

collaboration to our school building. We partner with organizations such as Lowes, Winn Dixie, local churches, and many other small businesses to ensure all are aware of our campus

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

Our stakeholders are school and district employees, community and business partners as well as students themselves.

Classroom teachers are expected to have positive interactions with students in the classroom, and receive feedback on whether that is observed or not. School administrators, as well as all other staff, are expected to interact positively with students, even while correcting or redirecting behavior.

Students are nominated by their teacher for going above and beyond to show their Tiger Pride as a Tiger MVP of the Week and are recognized and celebrated on campus.

Students can also earn Tiger Tokens by showing their ROAR (Respect, Only safe behaviors, Always doing your best, and making Responsible choices). Each week we have Tiger Token Tuesday where students who have earned tokens are able to go shopping at the ROAR store during their lunch period. Our community and business partners have donated items, or money to purchase, as a tangible reward for students.

Our student athletes on campus are reminded that they are just that, students before athletes, that other students look up to. They should encourage others, as well as be a positive role model, whether it is in the classroom or when participating in sports.