Clay County Schools

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://dis.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Carolyn Ayers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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: A (64%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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

Doctors Inlet Elementary School

2634 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://dis.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	No	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

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 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.

Doctors Inlet Elementary School's mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, rigorous, engaging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing learning opportunities that are relevant to the real world and transcend 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.

Doctors Inlet Elementary school exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring 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
Ayers, Carolyn	Principal	Instructional leader, attendance, MTSS, discipline, safety
Farber, Jocelyn	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, property & textbooks, FAST / STAR testing, transportation
Haynes, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Lang, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Guess, Carli	Teacher, K-12	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Wellons, Techla	Teacher, K-12	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Long, Hannah	Teacher, K-12	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Hanlin, Anita	Teacher, ESE	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Senters, April	School Counselor	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Raley, Montgomery	Teacher, K-12	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work
Bohn, Laura	Teacher, ESE	Input on ancillary curriculum materials, leading grade level PLC work

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/2/2018, Carolyn Ayers

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.*

6

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

578

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

3

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	74	88	62	78	76	76	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	553
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	7	7	13	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	7	19	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	4	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/19/2022

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	92	72	64	82	75	95	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	35	19	24	20	20	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	26	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	92	72	64	82	75	95	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	35	19	24	20	20	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	26	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	12	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	59%	63%	56%				63%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						61%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						58%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	51%	50%				72%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						70%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%						58%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	69%	59%				55%	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	61%	68%	-7%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	62%	-5%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2022					
	2019	76%	64%	12%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

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	73%	71%	2%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	70%	64%	6%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
06	2022					
	2019	74%	70%	4%	55%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

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	55%	63%	-8%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	30	41	43	37	51	64	32				
ELL	62	67		54	79						
BLK	61	63		47	56	55					
HSP	65	64	50	58	84	94	69				
MUL	54			62							
WHT	57	54	56	65	70	78	68				
FRL	51	52	49	53	63	70	60				

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	40	49	40	44	59	38	52				
ELL	36			43							
BLK	55	69		45	62						
HSP	55	71		61	71						
MUL	44	30		50	60						
WHT	68	67	54	69	63	40	72				
FRL	54	60	65	52	52	50	52				

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	57	63	65	76	47	41				
ELL	53	42		63	77						
ASN	90			100							
BLK	47	56	54	51	59	38	31				
HSP	57	70		67	50						
MUL	50	36		61	64						
WHT	67	63	57	76	73	64	63				
FRL	50	52	55	70	73	61	40				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	60
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	
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	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	69

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	58
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	57
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?

Based on FSA 2022 data, we see a lower percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA (59% achievement in ELA versus 62% achievement in math). However, in PM1 FAST progress monitoring data, we see a lower percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in Math (13% in math versus 35% in ELA). It's difficult to compare the two since one is EOY and the other is baseline.

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

Based on FSA 2022 data, the greatest need for improvement is ELA lowest 25% gains (53%) and ELA learning gains overall (56%). Looking at subgroup data, this would also include a need in learning gains for SWD (30%). Based on PM1 FAST progress monitoring data, the greatest need for improvement is

3rd and 4th grade math. 3rd grade baseline proficiency is 29% and 4th grade baseline proficiency is 21%.

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

The contributing factor for our ELA data dropping was a focus on math last year. We pushed our assistants in the upper grades into math classes. We also had a teacher change in 4th grade ELA mid year that included a long term sub. The transition between the two created some gaps in student learning, affecting half of our fourth grade students.

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

The area of greatest improvement based on FSA 2022 data was math learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile (from 40% to 76%).

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

Contributing factors to this improvement was restructuring our math instruction in 4th grade, pushing assistant support into the upper grades for math, and providing extra support to one of our newer math teachers in 3rd grade. We also became one-to-one with Chromebooks which allowed more time for students to have access to online learning tools.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we're going to need to be very intentional about small group instruction. This, along with restructuring and emphasizing our work in PLC and committing to the MTSS process, will help us close identified gaps and meet student needs, resulting in learning gains and achievement.

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.

Based on the Teacher Leadership Academy and teacher feedback from that workshop, our administrators are providing scaffolding and support to ensure all teachers have a complete understanding the PLC process and the research behind it. We've increased accountability in our PLC process. We've also included time in PLC to discuss the new MTSS procedures and our MTSS Facilitator has met with various grade levels to ensure teachers are prepared to move forward with MTSS, including students who have already started interventions and where they are in the process.

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

To sustain improvement, we are really focusing on our PLC process. We are relying on data to drive and inform instruction, then ensuring students have the interventions / remediation / enrichment needed to continue to grow. With 3 new teachers on our 4 person 6th grade wheel, we're also increasing walk throughs, promoting work with Kelsey Ivey, our beginning teacher coach, and checking in with new teachers to review the Vision for Instruction and provide support through regular meetings.

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: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on FSA 2022 data, the greatest need for improvement is ELA lowest 25% gains (53%) and ELA learning gains overall (56%). Looking at subgroup data, this would also include a need in learning gains for SWD (30%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on this year's data, our goal is for ELA learning gains to increase by 5% to 61% or higher.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use FAST assessments, Achieve3000, Lexia, and SAVVAS assessments to monitor progress throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We intentionally planned with the Florida Inclusion Network to ensure our ESE students had as much support as possible in the ELA block. We are intensifying our PLC work to target gaps and fill them effectively. We will continue using data to inform instruction and plan small groups. With the new procedures for MTSS, we will target students with needs and provide the interventions needed after using the problem solving protocol.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	We have chosen to work specifically with FIN, in small groups, on PLC, and through MTSS because we know that they can make the largest impact on our ELA learning gains.

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.

Work with FIN to plan schedule, strategically using our ESE teachers to support the ELA blocks.	
Person Responsible	Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)
Monitor FAST, Achieve3000, Lexia, and SAVVAS assessment data through data meetings and the PLC process.	

Person Responsible	Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

Provide support in the MTSS process and paperwork to ensure students are receiving interventions if needed.

Person Responsible	Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

Provide increased structure and accountability to the PLC process.

Person Responsible	Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)

#2. 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.	Based on PM1 FAST progress monitoring data, the greatest need for improvement is 3rd and 4th grade math. 3rd grade baseline proficiency is 29% and 4th grade baseline proficiency is 21%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on this year's data, our goal is for 4th grade math proficiency to increase 35 points, from 21% to 56%, by PM3.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use FAST assessments, iReady, and ALEKS data to monitor progress throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We are intensifying our PLC work to target gaps and fill them effectively. We will continue using data to inform instruction and plan small groups. With the new procedures for MTSS, we will target students with needs and provide the interventions needed after using the problem solving protocol.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	We have chosen to work specifically on small group instruction, on PLC, and through MTSS because we know that they can make the largest impact on our ELA learning gains.

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.

Monitor FAST, iReady, and ALEKS assessment data through data meetings and the PLC process.	
Person Responsible	Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)
Provide increased structure and accountability to the PLC process.	
Person Responsible	Jocelyn Farber (jocelyn.farber@myoneclay.net)
Provide support in the MTSS process and paperwork to ensure students are receiving interventions if needed.	
Person Responsible	Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Life Skills Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Life Skills Instruction can greatly impact student achievement, discipline, and self control. This can also affect attendance, as we know that students who have success academically and interpersonally are more likely to want to attend school on a regular basis. Based on the EWS indicators, attendance is an area for improvement. We currently have over 12% of students who have attended school less than 90% of days.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will boost student attendance from 12% to 9% of students in grades K-6 who have less than 90% attendance.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Students will be monitored through Synergy. The desired outcome is that students will attend school regularly and want to come to school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Implementing the lessons in the classrooms, practice and discussion based prompts in our morning announcements, and celebrating student success in life skills will increase student responsibility and positivity on campus. Teachers will submit positive notes to be mailed to students. This will help connect home and school, also including family members in the process. The guidance counselor will provide life skills lessons in the classrooms and also be available for small group and individual sessions as needed. We will continue to work with Rivers Edge counseling to ensure students have access to a counselor during the school week. PBIS strategies are used to encourage positive behaviors, including a cool

implemented for this Area of Focus.	down room where students can speak with an adult or just sit quietly to refocus and reflect before returning to class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PBIS strategies are chosen for this area of focus to boost student morale and confidence, resulting in increasing student attendance. When school is a safe and positive place to be, students will want to be there.

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.

Implementation of 7 Mindsets (lessons, student recognition monthly via assembly and certificate, postcards home, morning announcements, etc.)	
Person Responsible	Carolyn Ayers (carolyn.ayers@myoneclay.net)
Monthly life skills lessons in each classroom, specific to grade level and classroom needs.	
Person Responsible	April Senters (april.senters@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.

Doctors Inlet Elementary uses the 7 Mindsets to build positive school culture. We embed life skills into our morning announcements with real life examples, including opportunities for reflection and practice. Parents and guardians receive a monthly newsletter via email and/or social media that highlights activities, provides photos, and gives dates for upcoming events. Staff members receive a weekly newsletter via email with updates and staff recognition (including birthdays and shout outs). Students are recognized for positive

behaviors via 7 Mindset postcards home. Monthly assemblies are held for students who have exemplified one of the 7 Mindsets. SAC meets regularly to discuss school plans and concerns. Our PBIS team meets monthly and members communicate information to stakeholder groups. Our PFA is instrumental in providing extra recognition incentives to our staff and students. We are continuing to use our Discipline Flow Chart so the use of consequences are fair and equitable for all students.

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

Stakeholders include all faculty and staff, parents and guardians, community business partner,s and students. Faculty and staff strive to create a safe learning environment where all students feel welcomed while utilizing engaging and hands on lessons to inspire student academic growth. Parents and guardians work in collaboration with the faculty and staff through communication in order to increase involvement and belonging, creating an environment where students are excited to learn. Community business partners provide additional resources and funding to increase school spirit and connectedness, and students have the role of taking ownership over their learning within the classroom. All of these factors work together to build and maintain a positive school culture and environment.