

# Clay County Schools

# Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

1630 WOODPECKER LN, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://spc.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Cheryl Larson**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/30/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (62%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

1630 WOODPECKER LN, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://spc.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	53%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

### 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.**

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary is committed to working collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide students with an educational experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to empower students by providing an innovative and engaging learning environment that prepares them for future success.

### 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
Larson, Cheryl	Principal	The leadership team will create and monitor the SIP plan for the 2022-2023 school year.
Smith, Laura	Assistant Principal	The leadership team will create and monitor the SIP plan for the 2022-2023 school year.
Bragg, Regina	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade team lead
Heitman, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	4-6 grade Math lead teacher/ 6th grade Math and Science teacher
Davis, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	4-6 grade ELA team lead/ 5th grade ELA/ Science
Ohlendorf, Faith	Teacher, K-12	1st grade team lead
Maly, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	EC Montessori and kindergarten team lead
Dryden, Katherine	Instructional Media	Instructional Application Facilitator/ Media Specialist
Gelegan, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade team leader
Norton, Leah	Teacher, K-12	LE and UE Montessori team lead/ SAC chair
Paternoster, Dawn	Teacher, ESE	ESE self contained teacher/ team lead
Mills, Katlyn	Teacher, ESE	Intervention Team Facilitator/ ESE inclusion

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Thursday 9/30/2021, Cheryl Larson

**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.*

1

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

38



**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

508

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

10

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

9

**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	71	66	68	61	80	62	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	475	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	32	10	16	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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	16	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	0	0	2	15	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	

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	2	0	0	2	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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 9/26/2022

**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	60	66	62	70	54	57	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	12	14	12	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	7	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**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	2	7	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

**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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	60	66	62	70	54	57	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	12	14	12	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	7	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

#### 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	2	7	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

#### 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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	61%	63%	56%				63%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						67%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						64%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	51%	50%				63%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						62%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						49%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	69%	59%				71%	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	60%	68%	-8%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	64%	-21%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
06	2022					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	54%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

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	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	69%	-12%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	64%	1%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2022					
	2019	52%	70%	-18%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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	70%	63%	7%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

### 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	29	43	45	22	42	50					
BLK	38	63		31	44						
HSP	56	60		52	60						
MUL	63	40		63	60						
WHT	64	63	56	70	69	69	73				
FRL	52	52	44	56	56	41	76				
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	36	53	54	50	76	73	46				
BLK	40			58							
HSP	73	90		59	50						
MUL	72			78							
WHT	74	77	50	77	60		81				
FRL	63	77		68	55		74				
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	48	63	57	49	59	43	50				
BLK	57	64	30	57	64		70				
HSP	64	72		58	63	55	58				
MUL	65	71		60	71						
WHT	65	67	68	67	61	44	75				
FRL	54	56	57	56	56	48	61				

### 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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
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	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	
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	44
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	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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	66
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?

Over the past three years our SWD subgroup proficiency and learning gains have declined in ELA and Math.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 22 FSA assessments, our greatest need for improvement is meeting the needs of students in our lowest quartile, especially in ELA.

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

More targeted interventions are needed for our struggling readers. We have used F.I.N. as a resource to create a master schedule and have scheduled trainings and learning walks focused on our collaborative

practices. Our schedule includes collaborative planning time with ESE and Gen Ed teachers to ensure students are making adequate gains. We will continue to support teachers and paraprofessionals in our ESE unit and inclusion classes with professional development in order to strengthen the small group instruction and increase proficiency by closing learning gaps.

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

Our Science proficiency continues to improve.

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

Our lead Science teacher uses standards and data to drive instruction. Penda is also used to support instruction.

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

Strategies needed to accelerate learning:

- Intensify tier 1 instruction by only using district-approved core and supplemental curriculum.
- Focus on essential standards through PLCs and implement small group instruction tailored to student needs in ELA, Math and Science. We will track mastery of prerequisite skills for each subgroup to ensure equity for all students.
- Quarterly data meetings that support data driven instruction and collaborative practices.
- Strengthening PBIS school-wide to provide structures and routines that optimize the learning environment.

**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.**

F.I.N. - Collaborative Learning Walk and Feedback to follow/ continued coaching with administration in order to support our inclusion classes

Simple Rigor Reading Strategy for 3-6 grade ELA, SS and Science teachers to provide a consistent method of close reading.

Foundational Skills Training with district- approved supplemental programs such as KidLips, Heggerty, and Story Champs.

Utilize district coaches for teachers new to grade levels.

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

An outline of professional learning for the year is posted for teachers and PLC facilitators with monthly meetings to refine the plan. Grade level data meetings, PLCs and other meetings are listed on a matrix and on the school calendar as well as reminders in the weekly newsletters. Lead teachers developed a set of expectations for PLC work and created collective commitments with their teams to ensure purpose for the meetings. Progress will be celebrated monthly with students and teachers to encourage continued growth. Agendas for PLCs are shared with administration in order to continue to support this work. New teacher meetings are scheduled monthly and a survey provided before each to ensure teachers' needs are being met.



### **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.**

We will deepen standards based academic instruction to increase ELA proficiency. Small group instruction will be tailored to students' needs with an emphasis on priority standards. Based on the 22 FSA ELA assessment, 61% of our 3-6 grade students were proficient and 53% of our lower quartile made learning gains. Since our SWD/ ELL students did not show adequate growth, we will target our subgroups (SWD, ELL) and meet monthly to monitor that adequate progress is happening for all students. Increased ELA proficiency will positively impact Science performance. We will use district approved core and supplemental materials and utilize the decision tree for tier 2 and 3 interventions based on data to close learning gaps.

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

By May 2023, the percentage of 3-6 ELA students scoring at or above grade level on the FAST assessment will increase from 34% to 75%; the remaining 25% of 3-6 ELA students will demonstrate an average growth of 20% on the FAST ELA assessment so no students are performing far below grade level.

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

Progress will be monitored through regular walkthroughs with feedback, weekly PLCs as well as monthly grade level data meetings. Our Mid Year benchmark of expected growth is as follows: 54% at or above grade level; 9% approaching grade level; and 37% far below grade level using Achieve and Lexia data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

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

Acknowledging students positively; communicating clear learning targets and success criteria; checking for understanding of learning targets; responding to assessments aligned to learning targets

**for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based**

**Strategy:**

**Explain the  
rationale for  
selecting this  
specific  
strategy.**

By building authentic relationships with students, academic ownership increases. Students should be able to articulate their learning targets and success criteria. This enables students to participate in and contribute to the learning community and make meaning from challenging content.

**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.

Professional Learning Community (PLC) sessions that focus on district priorities and intensifying tier 1 instruction by aligning ELA curriculum with BEST standards through collaborative planning.

**Person  
Responsible** Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

The district decision tree will be used to determine intervention resources for tier 2 and tier 3 instruction based on individual needs of students. FAST PM1 and midyear will be used for k-3 students and Lexia will be implemented k-6 for individualized practice to close learning gaps. K-3 teachers will implement Heggerty, From Phonics to Reading to supplement SAVVAS instruction. In addition, K-1 will use Kid Lips and Story Champs to strengthen foundational skills. 3-6 will also use Achieve 3000 as a supplemental resource.

**Person  
Responsible** Katlyn Mills (katlyn.mills@myoneclay.net)

ESE inclusion teachers will plan regularly with gen ed teachers to provide supports and progress monitor SWD. Collaborative planning is built into the master schedule to provide time for collaboration.

**Person  
Responsible** Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@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 the 22 FSA Math assessment, 64% of our 3-6 grade students were proficient and 57% of our lower quartile made learning gains. Since our SWD/ ELL students did not show adequate growth, we will target our subgroups (SWD, ELL) and meet monthly to monitor that adequate progress is happening for all students. If teachers identify and monitor students identified in the lowest quartile for remediation and targeted instruction based on data, then the percentage of students in the lowest quartile obtaining gains will increase.

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

By May 2023, the percentage of 3-6 Math students scoring at or above grade level on the FAST assessment will increase from 13% to 75%; the remaining 25% of 3-6 ELA students will demonstrate an average growth of 20% on the FAST Math assessment so no students are performing far below grade level.

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

Progress will be monitored through regular walkthroughs with feedback, weekly PLCs as well as monthly grade level data meetings. Our Mid Year benchmark of expected growth is as follows: 44% at or above grade level; 18% approaching grade level; and 38% far below grade level using FAST data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

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

Acknowledging students positively; communicating clear learning targets and success criteria; checking for understanding of learning targets; responding to assessments aligned to learning targets

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

By building authentic relationships with students, academic ownership increases. Students should be able to articulate their learning targets and success criteria. This enables students to participate in and contribute to the learning community and make meaning from challenging content.

### 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.

K-5 will use iReady diagnostic and practice to supplement the Core program. 6th grade will use Aleks diagnostic and practice to supplement the Core program. K-6 will utilize the district decision tree to provide resources for tier 2 and tier 3 instruction.

**Person Responsible** Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

PLCs and Data Meetings will allow collaboration as well as build capacity for data driven decisions to close learning gaps.

**Person Responsible** Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

ESE inclusion teachers will plan regularly with gen ed teachers to provide supports and progress monitor SWD. Collaborative planning is built into the master schedule to provide time for collaboration.

**Person Responsible** Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

### #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

If we implement a schoolwide PBIS program, we will strengthen the school-home relationship, which will improve attendance, behavior and academics. Positive school culture is key to supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Our average daily attendance in 21-22 was 85.82%. By May 2023 we will increase our average daily attendance to 90%.

#### Monitoring:

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

Our attendance team will meet monthly to analyze attendance data and plan success team meetings for students with recurring absences and teacher concerns.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

#### Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Integrate SEL strategies, 7 Mindset lessons, Otter Values Matrix w/ lessons to help ensure consistency across campus, Otter Game Boards - positive phone calls home

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Our schoolwide PBIS plan provides a shared focus on improving school culture and environment; therefore students are more likely to engage academically and staff are more cohesive, which increases satisfaction and retention.

#### 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.

Otter Values Team meets monthly to analyze discipline and attendance data.

**Person Responsible** Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Attendance Team meets monthly to review attendance and contact families.

**Person Responsible** Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Otter Value Matrix and lessons are used for coaching throughout the year.

**Person Responsible** Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Counselors and BSC will be utilized to strengthen the intervention team.

**Person Responsible** Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

### RAISE

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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

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

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

According to Lexia Core 5 our percentage of students on target are as follows:

K - 32%

1 - 18%

2 - 51%

PreK - 2 teachers will utilize district approved core supplemental materials to strengthen tier 1 instruction.

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

Our 22 FSA ELA scores are as follows:

3 - 57%

4 - 39%

5 - 77%

6 - 64%

3-6 teachers will utilize district approved core supplemental materials to strengthen tier 1 instruction.

**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)**

By May 2023, the percentage of K-2 ELA students scoring at or above grade level on the Foundational Skills Performance of the FAST assessment will increase from 18% to 75%; the remaining 25% of k-2 ELA students will demonstrate an average growth of 20% on the Foundational Skills Performance of the FAST ELA assessment so no students are performing far below grade level.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By May 2023, the percentage of 3-6 ELA students scoring at or above grade level on the FAST assessment will increase from 34% to 75%; the remaining 25% of 3-6 ELA students will demonstrate an average growth of 20% on the FAST ELA assessment so no students are performing far below grade level.

**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.

Progress will be monitored through regular walkthroughs with feedback, weekly PLCs as well as monthly grade level data meetings. Our Mid Year benchmark of expected growth is as follows: 54% at or above grade level; 9% approaching grade level; and 37% far below grade level using Achieve and Lexia data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Larson, Cheryl, clarson@oneclay.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

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

K-1 Foundational Skills - Kid Lips, Story Champs, Heggerty, From Phonics to Reading, Lexia  
 2-4(5-6 for targeted students based on data) Foundational Skills - Heggerty Primary/ Primary Extension, From Phonics to Reading, Lexia  
 Utilize decision tree for interventions targeted to students' needs

**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?

Screeners such as Cubed Assessments and placement tests are used to identify need and prescribe programs from the district decision tree



**Action Steps to Implement:**

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning - K-1 Teacher training with Heggerty, Phonics for Reading, Kids Lips, and Story Champs to strengthen foundational skills 2-3 Teacher training with Phonics for Reading and Heggerty to close reading gaps for students 3-6 Teacher training with Simple Rigor strategy using Achieve articles to provide consistent close reading instruction vertically.	Larson, Cheryl, cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net
Literacy Coaching: F.I.N. will conduct learning walks using Collaborative Teaching Tool with administration and provide feedback to teachers the following day. F.I.N. will provide guidance with our collaborative planning, such as planning templates and agenda.	Larson, Cheryl, cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net
Whole group PLC will focus on intensifying tier 1 instruction and evidence-based teaching practices.	Larson, Cheryl, clarson@oneclay.net
Quarterly data meetings held to progress monitor students with a focus on subgroups at risk - SWD and black/ African American students.	Larson, Cheryl, cheryl.larson@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.**

Using 2021-2022 Climate Survey, we formed a PBIS team that met over the summer for training and collaboration to create a school-wide implementation plan. A common language was developed through our

Otter Values Matrix with expectations in common areas throughout the campus. We plan to increase opportunities to provide meaningful relationships between teachers and students. Teachers will intentionally plan immediate positive and fair feedback to encourage authentic growth while capitalizing on strengths and supporting areas of growth. Our positive recognition program promotes positive, respectful behaviors between personnel and scholars. This management system will enable us to recognize scholars throughout the school who are meeting behavior expectations and communicate this to all stakeholders in an effort to encourage scholars to achieve at higher levels. We will work to create a learning environment where adults understand that empathy helps children reach a higher brain state to better manage their own emotions and problem solve.

Our SAC committee meets quarterly to promote communication, involvement and understanding within the school

and community. In addition to building these relationships, Synergy, PBIS plan, showcase data events, and parent conference nights are all used to relay information to parents on current student academic progress and behaviors. Our school has transitional activities for our 6th grade students going to Lakeside Junior High Schools. We also reach out to the upcoming kindergarteners by taking flyers to the VPKS and use of social media. Our school has partnered with nearby churches to provide backpacks and weekend meals to support many of our families.

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

Administration - accountable for promoting a positive culture and environment and oversees all team in this effort.

Otter Values Team - analyze and respond to data, conduct training for staff and parents

Staff - Family engagement activities, promote Otter Values, models positive interactions

SRO - responsible for maintaining a safe campus

Community partners - provide resources and time to support school functions