

Jefferson County School District

Jefferson Schools K 12



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jefferson Schools K 12

50 DAVID RD, Monticello, FL 32344

www.jeffersonschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Jackie Pons

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (36%) 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Jefferson County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jefferson Schools K 12

50 DAVID RD, Monticello, FL 32344

www.jeffersonschools.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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Jefferson 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.

Jefferson Pre K-12 promotes a culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed learners in a safe and enriching environment to support future life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that....

- Trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship are essential to all.
- Everyone has intrinsic value.
- Every person can contribute something of worth to society.
- Individuals are responsible and accountable for their choices and decisions.
- Individuals need caring relationships and a nurturing environment in order to grow.
- Supportive family relationships are the foundation of the community.
- High expectations lead to higher performance which in turn, empowers the individual and strengthens society.
- Continuous learning is a lifelong process!

Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship are guiding character traits that are found in the Core Values at JCS. Individual worth and high expectations for all students are also part of this value system. JCS will use a common approach in effort to show that children matter, values matter, character matter, and academic excellence matters in our community as well as our country.

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
Pons, Jackie	Principal	The principal oversees the entire school, the education of the students, and ensures the SIP is being closely followed and implemented with fidelity.
Moore, Daniel	Assistant Principal	The A.P. assists with planning and preparing the SIP implementation. Additionally, the A.P. assists in monitoring the SIP and ensuring that it is implemented with fidelity.
Corder , Kathy	Instructional Coach	ELA Coach-works with teachers on planning for instruction, implementing instructional strategies aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards to ensure that the students are receiving materials on grade level at the rigor necessary for success.
Alexander, Kala	Instructional Coach	Math Coach-works with teachers on planning for instruction, implementing instructional strategies aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards to ensure that the students are receiving materials on grade level at the rigor necessary for success.
McCall, Shelbi	Administrative Support	Ms. McCall is the curriculum and testing coordinator. She works with the instructional coaches to ensure that they have what they need, helps to get coaches into classrooms, ensures instructional materials are selected that are in alignment with standards, and ensures that testing is done correctly at the school level.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Jackie Pons

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

760

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

NA

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

51

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	65	47	99	72	54	56	45	57	56	62	62	44	51	770
Attendance below 90 percent	19	12	8	23	12	12	15	14	7	10	16	6	13	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	12
Course failure in ELA	0	8	12	3	6	6	2	1	0	15	14	18	10	95
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	1	4	5	0	21	15	14	18	10	0	97
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	20	19	27	31	25	119	27	26	320
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	24	19	32	30	25	21	10	14	189
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	7	2	12	12	10	9	19	13	17	18	16	140

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	3	2	3	1	4	8	5	4	11	41	82

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/27/2022

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	54	49	76	56	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346
Attendance below 90 percent	24	24	30	26	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	3	2	6	7	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	13	11	8	12	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	11	4	13	13	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	27	27	19	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	13	9	13	19	4	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	9	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	54	49	76	56	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346
Attendance below 90 percent	24	24	30	26	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	3	2	6	7	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	13	11	8	12	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	11	4	13	13	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	27	27	19	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	13	9	13	19	4	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	9	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	30%		55%				36%		61%
ELA Learning Gains	36%						37%		59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	21%						48%		54%
Math Achievement	47%		42%				49%		62%
Math Learning Gains	48%						45%		59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						39%		52%
Science Achievement	32%		54%				27%		56%
Social Studies Achievement			59%						78%

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	45%	45%	0%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	32%	0%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	26%	26%	0%	56%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	51%	51%	0%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	35%	0%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	24%	24%	0%	53%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	22	24	14	23	36	42	31				
ELL	30	30		50	60						
BLK	27	37		42	47	23	35				
HSP	24	36		48	64						
WHT	47	42		71	36						
FRL	28	34	10	45	46	40	29				
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	14	15		14							
ELL	29			31							
BLK	29	19		31	5	20					
HSP	35			19							
WHT	44	46		54	50		29				
FRL	31	32	45	33	15	18	9				
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	15	38	64	17	33	43					
ELL											
BLK	29	33	48	46	42	26	24				
HSP	50	50		56	50						
WHT	51	36		56	52						
FRL	35	30	48	48	41	29	18				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	298
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	49
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	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

There is a decrease in math and reading achievement on state assessments across all grade levels, and gains are inconsistent through state assessment and progress monitoring data. Students with disabilities show inconsistencies and declines in achievement within and across school years. Inconsistencies were also found in i-Ready which was used for progress monitoring.

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

Students with disabilities, minority students, and ESOL students show the greatest need for improvement.

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

Jefferson Somerset Charter did not have certified teachers in a majority of the classrooms, therefore all teachers are now highly-qualified under the public school Jefferson County Schools. These teachers are subject area experts and have the strategies to be highly effective to accelerate our students. The MTSS system does not solidly provide layers of support as students enter new tiers or levels; tier one support with each layer explicitly provided on top of the next will be important toward addressing this need. To improve our progress monitoring we will be implementing STAR for more accurate data.

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

Fifth grade math showed the greatest improvement as demonstrated by FSA data and progress monitoring from beginning to end of year.

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

Placing a certified, highly qualified teacher in the course improved the fifth grade math score, as compared to none certified teachers.

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

Solid tier one instruction with data analysis and reteach plans is necessary to ensure mastery of standards and material by more students prior to implementing tiered levels of support, increasing school-wide levels of proficiency and implementing appropriate differentiated tier one 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.

Weekly professional development in the form of professional learning communities will be provided for teachers. PLCs will focus on answering the questions what do we want students to learn, how will we know when they have learned it, what will we do when they do not learn it, and what will we do when have already learned it. The inquiry process that teachers engage in through PLC questions will allow them to learn from each other, enhance their tier one instruction, and accelerate student learning. Learning walks will be provided for teachers to engage in conversation about effective instructional practices. The school's instructional coach will provide professional development and coaching to teachers as needed based upon data, observation, and performance.

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

The school is implementing an MTSS team made up of an RTI coordinator, PBIS coordinator, Guidance Counselor, and Instructional Coach, who will all work together and alongside administration to analyze data, evaluate needs, review progress toward goals, and support teachers.

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 Collaborative Planning

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

The practice of instructional coaching in the classroom is one of the most effective ways to bring out the best in the teachers and students, to develop their talents and strengths, to build teacher efficacy and confidence and to nurture their learning. Coaching is a two way dialogue where the intention is to genuinely involve the other person in finding solutions through a process of effective questioning and listening.

Based on 2021-2022 school year data, numerous teachers were not certified and were not of the ability to teach due to the lack of knowledge of standards and teaching practices.

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 100% of teachers will take part in common planning with their coaches and grade level leaders.

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

This will be monitored by taking attendance at every common planning meeting and by conducting classroom walk throughs to ensure that the discussed look-fors are being implemented. Data will be disseminated through email or through verbal communication by the instructional coach. Common planning occurs at least weekly in each subject area facilitated by either team leaders or instructional coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

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

Coaching schedules, coaching logs, and classroom walkthrough trend data will all be used to determine the effectiveness of the common planning.

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

Teachers engaging in common planning and professional learning communities to plan standards aligned instruction will provide consistence across classrooms and endure of the standard is being met. This will be ensured through consistent administrative walkthroughs to provide support and feedback based on data collected.

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.

Hire effective/highly effective instructional coaches for ELA, math, and science.

Person Responsible Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

Ensure there is common planning time in the master schedule for teachers to utilize with the instructional coaches.

Person Responsible Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

Each instructional coach will ensure that the norms and correct procedures are implemented in their subject area. These collaborative/common planning sessions will take places on a consistent schedule.

Person Responsible Kathy Corder (kcorder@jeffersonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

By matching what is taught in the classroom to the standards in each subject area, students (and their parents and teachers) will know what teachers should be teaching, what students should be learning and what they will be tested on. Within the former charter school system, teachers did not have to be certified to be a classroom teacher. Therefore, test scores fell dramatically.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

When conducting formal observations, 90% of the instructional staffs' Common Board Configuration will align with the standard aligned materials being utilized coupled with students' ability to engage in referencing the configuration as a tool.

Monitoring:

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

Lesson plans will be evaluated by the administrative team and the standards will be ensured to be the core to drive the instruction. Plans for the upcoming week must be submitted to the administrative team no later than Thursday of the prior week. Feedback would be provided through email and instructional coaching sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Moore (dmoore@jeffersonschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Professional development (on new B.E.S.T. Standards implementation) (Hattie's .41)
Clear goal intentions (lesson plans will include standards in subject area taught) (Hattie's .48)

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Professional development has an effect size of .41 (Hattie's). Teachers will receive PD on the new B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. Teachers will then set clear goal intentions (.48) via lesson plans, which will be monitored regularly by administration. By providing PD on B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, then requiring teachers to plan and implement standards based lessons, in theory teacher knowledge should improve, thereby leading to increased academic ability for students as measured by data.

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.

Teachers will receive professional development on the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. This will occur after school or during inservice trainings.

Person Responsible Kathy Corder (kcorder@jeffersonschools.net)

Teachers will apply knowledge learned in professional development on B.E.S.T. ELA standards in their lesson plans. This will be observed through submitted lesson plans and classroom walkthrough observations.

Person Responsible Daniel Moore (dmoore@jeffersonschools.net)

Coaching and follow up to be provided to teachers and staff as needed.

Person Responsible Kathy Corder (kcorder@jeffersonschools.net)

Data will be assessed as it becomes available to determine progress and determine if additional support is needed.

Person Responsible Daniel Moore (dmoore@jeffersonschools.net)

#3. 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.

Students with disabilities will increase ELA and math gains to meet or exceed the state's average and the lower quartile will increase to meet or exceed the state's average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will take the STAR math and reading progress monitoring to determine the students' areas of weakness. Students will take the assessment at least three times per year. Teachers will use the BEST standards and data from progress monitoring and classroom observations.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data will be evaluated by administration and coaches. Teachers will have data chats with

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will receive small group instruction via MTSS that will provide scaffolding and explicit teaching strategies that will target the needs of the individual student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Small group instruction .47 effect size (Hattie's)
RTI 1.29 effect size (Hattie's)
Scaffolding .82 effect size (Hattie's)
Explicit teaching strategies .57 effect size (Hattie's)

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.

Hire certified teachers with the correct certification.

Person Responsible

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

Use of common planning time to work with instructional coach on aligned lessons to reach students better.

Person Responsible

Kathy Corder (kcorder@jeffersonschools.net)

Teachers to use small group instruction with MTSS

Person Responsible

Daniel Moore (dmoore@jeffersonschools.net)

#4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

In this time of transition, a strong team was needed to make the gains JCS students deserve. An effective ILT helps a school improve teaching and learning through increased collaboration and distributive leadership. Schools with strong ILTs are more effective at assessing the progress of teachers and students and making adjustments as needed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Facilitate the self-assessment process and develop the school's School Improvement Plan (SIP). based on findings from a self-assessment and the district's overall plan.

Monitoring:

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

Throughout the year, track the school's progress toward meeting the SIP goals and implementing the action steps. Help instructional teams use student performance data to inform instructional decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Evidence has shown that the quality of instructional leadership in a school can make a significant difference to student learning outcomes The Centre for Educational Statistics and Evaluation found that leadership explains about one-quarter of the total difference in student outcomes explained by all school-level variables, as compared to classroom factors explain around one-third.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Hattie's Model informs us that instructional leaders focus more on students. They look to the teachers' and school's impact on student learning and instructional issues. They conduct observations and ensure that professional development is occurring to enhance student learning and communicate high expectations for a school environment that is conducive to learning.

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.

Observing a teacher's lesson and providing feedback.

Person Responsible Daniel Moore (dmoore@jeffersonschools.net)

Modelling a particular teaching strategy in a classroom.

Person Responsible Kathy Corder (kcorder@jeffersonschools.net)

Observing a teacher working with a small group of students on a diagnostic assessment task and making a judgement about the skills and understanding demonstrated.

Person Responsible Daniel Moore (dmoore@jeffersonschools.net)

Working with a group of teachers on a year level or stage basis to analyze progress made on a cohort basis, and to identify students at risk along with the appropriate tier level of intervention they may need.

Person Responsible Kathy Corder (kcorder@jeffersonschools.net)

Providing professional learning for whole-school staff on topics of general relevance or specific need in relation to literacy and numeracy teaching and learning, such as how to structure a literacy block and how to engage students in ownership of their learning.

Person Responsible Kathy Corder (kcorder@jeffersonschools.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

Based on the data available, a majority students in grades kindergarten through second grade are below grade level in phonological proficiency.

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

Based on the data available, 45% of 3rd graders, 32% of 4th graders and 26% of 5th graders are performing below grade level on FSA.

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)

Based on the data available, a majority of students in grades 3-5 are below grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

2. 60% of ELA lowest (25%) quartile based on 2022 FSA ELA will reach grade level/proficiency measured by the 2023 FAST ELA assessment.

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.

Based on STAR scores, students are placed in the MTSS process to focus on specific phonological and phonics skills and sounds. Depending on student tiered instruction, students are given weekly or monthly assessments to monitor when students master specific skills and sounds. Additionally, all students take the mid-year STAR progress monitoring assessment. These scores will be used to decide if the instructional materials and strategies are showing positive gains for our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McCall, Shelbi, smccall@jeffersonschools.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?

For Phonological Awareness and Phonics, the evidence-based strategies being implemented include explicit, systematic phonemic awareness/phonics instruction (Hattie's .47), small group instruction (Hattie's .47), MTSS/RTI (Hattie's 1.29), and scaffolding (Hattie's .82).

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?

The evidence-based strategies being implemented include explicit, systematic phonemic awareness/phonics instruction (Hattie's .47), small group instruction (Hattie's .47), MTSS/ RTI (Hattie's 1.29), and scaffolding (Hattie's .82) via Lenoxik, Leaps and Amplify CKLA Intervention. Each of these evidence-based strategies have been proven in the widely recognized Hattie's Visible Learning study to have the potential to accelerate or the potential to considerably accelerate student achievement.

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
Select evidence-based strategies	Moore, Daniel , dmoore@jeffersonschools.net
Select educational programs to meet the needs based on data	Moore, Daniel , dmoore@jeffersonschools.net
Train staff on evidence-based strategies and program use	Corder , Kathy , kcorder@jeffersonschools.net
Implement MTSS with fidelity schoolwide, incorporating evidence-based strategies and curriculum	McCall, Shelbi, smccall@jeffersonschools.net
Leadership does observations/walkthroughs	Pons, Jackie, jpons@jeffersonschools.net
Periodically assess student progress per reading plan requirements	McCall, Shelbi, smccall@jeffersonschools.net
Utilize coaching and mentor teachers/classrooms as needed based on student data	Corder , Kathy , kcorder@jeffersonschools.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.

JCS implements many strategies and techniques to effectively communicate, build positive relationships, and encourage involvement with families. Teachers send home reminders and information to parents using the Remind 101 and Dojo apps and conference with parents when needed. Parents have access to students' grades on Focus and Edgenuity, and teachers post assignments with detailed instructions on Classlink. Deficiencies are sent home each 9 weeks. Students are recognized for academic and extracurricular achievement. Parents are able to find the school's mission vision on the school's website along with a calendar of upcoming events and recognition of school and student success. Parents also complete a survey that allows them to voice concerns and input regarding JCS. The data is compiled and drives future decisions. A School Advisory Council made up of parents, community members, and school staff meets monthly or as needed.

Teachers are also encouraged to take part in collaborative PLCs creating a partnership and culture of teacher efficacy and collaboration in education. JCS educational philosophy is cemented in the foundation that all students can learn, grow, and progress regardless of sex, race, ethnic background, or socio-economic status. This philosophy materializes through positive relationship building and consistent communication between staff, students, parents, and other pertinent stakeholders. Additionally, school discipline is viewed as a teaching opportunity, and good behavior is praised and rewarded to promote a positive environment where kids feel happy and safe and are engaged in the learning process.

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

At JCS, school leadership sets the tone for a positive culture and environment through themed initiatives and spearheads their implementation. Leadership is also responsible for providing necessary supports to faculty and staff to ensure efficient procurement and implementation of varied learning modalities and techniques.

Our faculty and staff nurtures the growth of positive relationships with all students to maximize the potential for both academic and social emotional growth.

Outside the campus, local businesses, parents and various community members are included via SAC, where they are involved and committed to helping make appropriate educational decisions that will lead to positive change and impact for both students and teachers within the school environment.

Other stakeholders might include lunchroom staff, custodians and bus drivers. All these workers contribute to a positive environment that meets the daily needs of students, ensuring they are at school on time, in a clean and safe environment, and have nutritious food, thereby allowing students to be their best.