

Clay County Schools

# Shadowlawn 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Shadowlawn Elementary School

2945 COUNTY ROAD 218, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://sle.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Whitney Johnson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 50%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (61%)<br>2018-19: A (67%)<br>2017-18: B (58%)  |
| <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>   | N/A   |
| * 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](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.

---

## 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Shadowlawn Elementary School

2945 COUNTY ROAD 218, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://sle.oneclay.net>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-6                        | No                     | 50%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 21%  |

### 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.

Shadowlawn Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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

Shadowlawn Elementary's 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.

### 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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Johnson, Whitney | Principal           |                                 |
| Libretto, Lara   | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Studer, Lauren   | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Hager, Josh      | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Hillis, Shannon  | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Adair, Kim       | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Beck, Laura      | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Whitney Johnson

**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.*

5

**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.*

12

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

57

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

738

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

4

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

4

**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                              | 95          | 99 | 108 | 101 | 90 | 95 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 692   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 25          | 40 | 40  | 29  | 20 | 21 | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 201   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 2   | 1   | 1  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| 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   | 0   | 8  | 12 | 14  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0   | 6  | 27 | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0   | 8  | 11 | 14  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/29/2022



**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                              | 104         | 100 | 105 | 78 | 97 | 95 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 668   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9           | 7   | 8   | 6  | 6  | 7  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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   | 7  | 9  | 8  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 10 | 10 | 14 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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                              | 104         | 100 | 105 | 78 | 97 | 95 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 668   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9           | 7   | 8   | 6  | 6  | 7  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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   | 7  | 9  | 8  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 10 | 10 | 14 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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             | 67%    | 63%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 68%    | 65%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 58%    |          |       |        |          |       | 63%    | 62%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 44%    |          |       |        |          |       | 60%    | 54%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 76%    | 51%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 74%    | 70%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 64%    |          |       |        |          |       | 74%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    |          |       |        |          |       | 71%    | 56%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 60%    | 69%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 60%    | 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 | 81%    | 68%      | 13%                        | 58%   | 23%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 71%    | 64%      | 7%                         | 58%   | 13%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -81%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 62%      | -8%                        | 56%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -71%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 66%    | 64%      | 2%                         | 54%   | 12%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 81%    | 71%      | 10%                        | 62%   | 19%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 76%    | 69%      | 7%                         | 64%   | 12%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -81%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 64%      | -13%                       | 60%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -76%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 82%    | 70%      | 12%                        | 55%   | 27%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -51%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 61%    | 63%      | -2%                        | 53%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -61%   |          |                            |       |                         |

### 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                                       | 47       | 44     | 44          | 61        | 53      | 60           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 53       | 55     |             | 80        | 82      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 53       | 76     |             | 57        | 55      | 50           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 57     | 43          | 78        | 65      | 53           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 62       | 52     | 40          | 71        | 60      | 55           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 41       | 27     | 35          | 50        | 33      | 20           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 58       | 54     |             | 68        | 46      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 50       | 64     |             | 59        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 57       |        |             | 57        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 65       | 42     | 47          | 73        | 49      | 34           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 56       | 36     | 42          | 63        | 46      | 39           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 45       | 50     | 60          | 54        | 69      | 70           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 52       | 58     |             | 74        | 84      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 70     |             | 79        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 58       | 53     |             | 63        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 63     | 61          | 74        | 72      | 70           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 54     | 58          | 67        | 69      | 71           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 61  |
| 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 |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 424 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 49  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| Native American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0   |
| Asian Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Black/African American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 68  |
| 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   | 55  |
| 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   | 55  |
| 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                                | 56  |
| 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?

Overall, we experienced a decrease on both math and reading in achievement, learning gains of the lowest 25%, and overall learning gains. Small group instruction was a priority and approached with a sense of urgency thru additional training of teachers in truly differentiating instruction and ensuring data was analyzed on small groups which documented fluidity of groups based on individual student need. Groups were skill based and students tracked their own data and were provided a greater ability to take ownership of their learning.

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

Due to the long term effects of Covid, learning gaps widened for a majority of students. Based on Iready math data and Lexia ELA data, students struggled to progress to fully close their learning gaps over the year.

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

Time and 15% to 20% daily average absentee rate was the greatest contributing factor in closing student learning gaps. New district attendance policies and procedures combined with positive behavioral incentives for coming to school will provide leverage in closing student learning gaps.

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

Our greatest improvement was seen in our 6th grade special education population for math. 6th grade Math increased 43 points placing them at 95% in overall bottom quartile learning gains. That is an 87 point increase when looking at cohort 5th to 6th comparisons.

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

The 6th grade math team used individualized strategic small groups that utilized fluid data to drive instruction.

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

Moving forward, we have protocols and procedures in place that will allow small groups to occur safely while also taking an individualized strategic approach to small group instruction.

**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.**

Targeted Professional Learning Communities have been established to allow teachers to plan with one another in content area, flexibility for data and strategic needs, and whole group for a larger focus. These new PLC's have been set up with protocols and norms to ensure all instructional staff are engaged and productive to best serve the needs of students.

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

The Positive Behavior Rewards program will create continuity in expectation and a token economy system.

Tier 2&3 math and literacy supplements to the core will provide researched based materials to support core instruction and close instructional gaps.

Targeted Professional Learning Communities will allow teachers to focus on individual student need while supporting one another in best practice.

**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 Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Due to the historical drop in 5th grade Science, Shadowlawn will focus on the protocol based literacy strategy, Read Discuss Read, to identify tier 3 vocabulary and their affixes and roots specific to Science. 5th grade Science covers standards from the 3rd to 5th grade with tier 3 vocabulary not received through direct exposure.

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

Students will be assessed using the 2022/2023 FSSA. Shadowlawn will increase by 5 percentage points and move our proficiency from 63% to 68% 5th grade will monitor incremental changes to meet this outcome through district Science assessments.

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

Science progression will be monitored through district level benchmarks to ensure that standards mastery is occurring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Whitney Johnson  
 (whitney.johnson@myoneclay.net)

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

Read Discuss Read will be the evidenced based strategy used to increase Science achievement through literacy in the 5th grade. Students will read for fluency, identify unknown vocabulary and their affixes and roots, then discuss the concept through text dependent questioning over the course of multiple reads.

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

Students need to have a deep comprehension of the Science text, so they are able to focus and conceptualize the standard rather than struggling through the text.

**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. Inservice for teachers in implementation of CLOSE reading strategies(RDR).
2. Identification of tier 3 Science vocabulary aligned to NGSSS Science assessment.
3. Monthly data chats to discuss the progress monitoring of students.

**Person Responsible**

Whitney Johnson  
 (whitney.johnson@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.**

Based on the 2020-2021 FSA, SWD students are still struggling to perform at the proficiency levels of their non-disabled peers. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, SWD students have regressed from pre-Covid levels in ELA based on the comparative cohort trends from the previous year. SWD students will require more individualized instruction through differentiation to close gaps and meet their individual needs.

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

SWD students will regain ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gain levels of 2019/2020 school year in ELA on the 2022/2023 FAST assessment. This will require SWD to increase LQ Gains by 18%, moving from 42% to 60%.

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

Monitoring will be completed using the Lexia diagnostic and the FAST progress monitoring assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Whitney Johnson (whitney.johnson@oneclay.net)

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

Shadowlawn will utilize the Lexia Skill Builder Lessons and Heggerty Bridge the Gap to differentiate instruction through product, process, and content based on the the student's instructional profile provided by fluid progress monitoring.

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

Due to the learning gaps increased by COVID19 and increased absences, students will require individualized instruction to meet their individual needs in ELA.

**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. Monthly data chats to progress monitor the achievement levels and areas of opportunity for our SWD population
2. Attend weekly ESE team Professional Learning Communities to plan for student differentiation
3. Utilize the the Iready teacher toolbox for differentiated curriculum

**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.**

If all teachers implement the Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports with fidelity and high expectations, then student's will develop self awareness, self management, social and relationship skills and responsible decision making.

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

If we implement Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports a to address Behavior Incident Tracking which accounted for 73% of our 2021/2022 referrals, then we should see a drop of 23% in this category in the 2022/2023 school year.

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

The 7 Mindsets provides targeted Social Emotional Learning for students which addresses social situations and expectation for pro-social interaction. Each month will tackle a different characteristic for SEL development.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

The schedule you will follow when teaching the lessons was developed by Clay County and aligned to the character ed crosswalk:

October: 100% Accountable

November & December: Attitude of Gratitude

January: We are Connected

February: Live to Give

March: Everything is Possible

April: Passion First

May: The Time is Now

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

In an effort to meet the social emotional and mental and behavioral needs of students and staff, an SEL team will be implemented. Our measurable outcome will be addressed via a decrease in the number of discipline referrals.

**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. Establish the SLE 7 Mindsets team
2. Attend monthly 7 Mindsets school-based Professional Learning Communities
3. Follow the district crosswalk for 7 Mindsets implementation

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

## 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.

Shadowlawn Elementary is a community school. Our various business partners support our students and families through donations of time and incentives for our students, volunteering at school events including our annual highlight event "FALALALA & Food Trucks". Russell Baptist, First Baptist, and River Christian Church of Middleburg hosts a "backpack ministry" in providing backpacks full of non-perishable food for our families. During the holidays, SLE provides Thanksgiving and Christmas gift baskets to families. We also provide Christmas gifts to our students whose families may need assistance. Our business partners and parents always make a strong contribution to these efforts.

Our SLE Parent Volunteer Organization (PVO) assists with school picture days, health screenings and fundraising. This group also assists teachers as homeroom volunteers with various tasks teachers may need.

We have implemented for the last 3 years Positive Referrals for students. Any staff member has access to the Positive Referral form and can recognize a student for exemplary leadership in following our Falcon Guidelines for Success and/or setting the example for others in acts of kindness towards others. The student is recognized by SLE Administration and given a small treat bag. A phone call is made home to the parent.

SLE also recognizes once a month "Falcon Leaders". Teachers choose a student monthly who has exemplified strong leadership traits. The students are invited to a snowcone social and receive a certificate to take home which has been completed by the teacher honoring the student.

Our SLE School Advisory Council (SAC) meets at least quarterly (4 times per year). This committee is comprised of parents, business partners, community members and SLE instructional & support staff. The committee not only reviews the SIP, but also works collaboratively to review schoolwide safety and academic measures and concerns as well as providing input on school procedures, communication with all stakeholders and referrals to others who may be interested in serving on SAC or attending meetings. The committee has also assisted with seeking community members and businesses to donate time, items and funds to the school.

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

Our PBIS team plays a crucial role in assembling a token economy system (PBIS Rewards) of support that created continuity among behavioral expectations throughout the school.

Our Guidance Counselor ensure students receive the 7mindsets lesson which promotes social emotional learning to all students.

Instructional staff hold classroom morning meetings to reaffirm the PBIS process and the SEL mindset promoted each month by guidance.