

Clay County Schools

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

S Bryan Jennings Elementary School

215 CORONA DR, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://sbj.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty and staff of S. Bryan Jennings Elementary will collaboratively work with all stakeholders to establish an inclusive, equitable, and safe learning community to support high expectations and maximum achievement in all students by identifying and meeting the unique academic, social, and emotional needs of each individual student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School exists to prepare our scholars to be adult-life ready by forming lifelong learners for success in a competitive global market.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taylor, Mary	Principal	Mrs. Taylor is the instructional leader of the school. She leads the staff as they disaggregate all data sources to identify areas of strength and opportunities to grow. She is responsible for the implementation of all state, district, and school initiatives.
Chapman, Debbie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Chapman is a school administrator responsible for supporting the principal in the instructional leadership of our school, as well as to the overall well-being and safety of the scholars and staff.
Gleneski, Nancy	Reading Coach	Mrs. Gleneski is a Title I reading intervention teacher, as well as the Intervention Team Facilitator. She also leads our school's PBIS committee and serves as our school SAC Chair.
Ruckersfeldt, Jordan	Math Coach	Mrs. Ruckersfeldt leads math interventions, assists with small group practices and data analyses for differentiation, and advances Eureka instruction and implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards. Additionally, she serves as the Title I Lead.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

A School Advisory Council comprised of administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, and community members review and provide input to the School Improvement Plan. Additionally, teachers are made aware of School Improvement Plan goals- which are developed in conjunction with our Title I plan in response to student achievement data- at the start of the new school year in order to provide feedback.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Progress towards SIP goals is monitored through regular School Advisory Council meetings, as well as quarterly data meetings with teachers. During these meetings, student progress towards these goals are analyzed, the status of students who are in most need are discussed, and action steps and resources to close achievement gaps and reach our SIP goals are vetted. If a revision to the SIP is necessary, that revision will be presented to both the School Advisory Council and to teachers and staff for input before a change is made.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	19	24	13	16	15	21	16	0	0	124	
One or more suspensions	2	4	6	6	3	5	9	0	0	35	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	18	21	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	12	20	5	0	0	62	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	14	15	22	0	0	55	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	21	16	19	14	16	16	15	0	0	117	
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	2	1	10	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	0	11	9	3	5	9	3	0	0	40	
Course failure in Math	0	3	4	1	6	2	2	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	13	16	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	14	24	0	0	63	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	30	22	40	27	27	0	0	158	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	3	4	8	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	3	6	2	2	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	21	16	19	14	16	16	15	0	0	117	
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	2	1	10	0	0	16	
Course failure in ELA	0	11	9	3	5	9	3	0	0	40	
Course failure in Math	0	3	4	1	6	2	2	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	13	16	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	14	24	0	0	63	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	30	22	40	27	27	0	0	158	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	3	4	8	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	3	6	2	2	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52	59	53	51	63	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				64			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			22		
Math Achievement*	55	64	59	50	51	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				68			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			52		
Science Achievement*	62	65	54	57	69	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		55	59				68		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	226
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	52			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	54			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	64			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	56			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	52			55			62					
SWD	42			46			70				4	
ELL	31			62							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			51			60				4	
HSP	53			57			40				4	
MUL	41			48							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	64			58			74				4	
FRL	47			49			49				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	64	60	50	68	64	57					
SWD	35	54	50	30	54	56	38					
ELL	31	50		13	50							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	70	73	39	65	53	33					
HSP	49	59	40	53	67	75	46					
MUL	54	68		54	74							
PAC												
WHT	59	62		55	71	60	77					
FRL	44	59	63	42	64	61	46					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	45	40	22	47	48	52	46					68
SWD	33	22	9	42	43	45	38					
ELL	28			28								68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	39	27	36	36		33					
HSP	38	42		36	42		33					60
MUL	23	30		42	30							
PAC												
WHT	59	41		62	64		68					
FRL	36	36	18	41	51	50	35					70

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	52%	61%	-9%	47%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	75%	-8%	54%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	62%	-24%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	67%	-6%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	63%	-8%	51%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our ELA proficiency is the data component that shows the lowest performance. Though there was growth, 51% to 55%, this was the component that showed the least growth from the previous year. Contributing factors that kept the score from growing more, include an increased population of ELL learners who were non-English speaking which results in a significant learning gap. Students typically have limited access to books, are not frequently read to at home, have minimal background knowledge from exposure to events and experiences outside the home. This is due in large part to the lower

socioeconomic demographics of our school population.

The need for additional personnel to help provide more targeted instruction to help close gaps is imperative to our learners. However, this past year, we saw a strain on teacher time and resources needed to meet individual student needs.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Though there was no decline, ELA showed the least amount of growth this past year. There was only 4% growth from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023. Contributing factors that kept the score from growing more, include an increased population of ELL learners who were non-English speaking which results in a significant learning gap. Students typically have limited access to books, are not frequently read to at home, have minimal background knowledge from exposure to events and experiences outside the home. This is due in large part to the lower socioeconomic demographics of our school population.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was fifth grade ELA. Our fifth grade ELA average scale score was 313, and the state average scale score was 321. Out of the sixty-seven students who were tested, eight of those students were English Language Learners with very limited English language knowledge and have been in the country for less than two years. Additionally, eight of these sixty-seven fifth grade students are ESE students. Five of the eight ESE students were new to our school and showed significant gaps in foundational reading skills, which were addressed through intensive Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. Despite the intensive tiered instruction provided to the students they still had significant gaps in foundational reading skills at the end of the year. Historically, our ELA scores over the past few years have been below our district and state average. While great efforts are made each year to bolster whole group and small group instruction and great gains are made, we typically fall short of proficiency. Foundational skills are not solidified; gaps in early years continue to grow as students progress through the grades; and proficiency levels continue to fall below expectations.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

That data component that showed the most improvement was in Math. Tier 1 instruction using the core curriculum and supplemental programs was provided with fidelity to all students. Explicit small group targeted instruction was provided based on student need. Focused and structured PLC work was completed with fidelity while continually analyzing student data to determine next steps. Additional support for grade levels was provided for ELL support and additional Title 1 assistance was given.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on the FAST. Another concern is the large number of students presenting with substantial reading deficiencies.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA vocabulary, comprehension/main idea
2. Math - mathematical problem solving and reasoning
3. PBIS - attendance, lessen the number of referrals

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Historically, the students of SBJ have struggled with reading comprehension; more specifically, with vocabulary and reading grade level texts. Students begin the school year one to two grade levels below proficiency. Tremendous gains are made each year, but it is not enough to close these significant achievement gaps. While SBJ has increased its overall proficiency to 55% in 2023 from 51% in 2022, we are still far below our overall proficiency goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By implementing evidence-based strategies to ensure specific student needs are met for proficiency in reading comprehension, we will see a 10% increase in learning gains, from 55% to 65%, in reading comprehension by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through progress monitoring assessments, Lexia Core5 and Lexia Power Up, Savvas assessments, and common formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

SBJ has chosen the following strategies to elevate ELA instruction: small group instruction, explicit vocabulary instruction, an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the five components of reading (Lexia Core5 and Lexia Power Up), direct-explicit instruction, and progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lexia Core5 is an evidence based program addressing identified gaps in student learning, aligned with the 5 components of reading. The program allows for data driven differentiation closing individual literacy learning gaps and providing explicit instructional opportunities to teachers with lesson components that can be administered in a small group setting. Embedded assessment provides ongoing, actionable data for teachers to prioritize and plan offline instruction. The rationale for the explicit teaching of comprehension skills and explicit vocabulary instruction is that these components can be improved by teaching students to use specific cognitive strategies or to reason strategically when they encounter barriers to understanding what they are reading. Providing focused, intensive, small group interventions for identified students at risk for reading deficiencies including the 5 core reading elements will close learning gaps and improve overall literacy. Progress monitoring will enable teachers to respond to and differentiate instruction based on student needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All ELA teachers will implement daily small group instruction based on student data that will be documented and tracked.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Administration and Title I ELA Coach will select the teachers exhibiting best practices focused on for the monthly look-for's to showcase as model classrooms for walkthroughs and also select 4 teachers that will benefit from observing best practices based upon the monthly walkthrough data cycles.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction & Title I classroom assistants will assist with providing small group instruction cycles in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All teachers will implement explicit vocabulary instruction to increase ELA proficiency through the following: direct instruction of vocabulary words for a specific text and instruction of high frequency vocabulary words that is useful in many contexts.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Administrators will continue to seek professional development opportunities and information through on-going education with FASA and NAESP

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

ELA teachers will utilize Lexia Core 5 and Power Up.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will provide direct and explicit instruction in ELA to improve students' reading comprehension. Comprehension strategies are routines and procedures that readers use to help them make sense of texts. All teachers will focus on comprehension strategies such as, summarizing, asking and answering questions, paraphrasing, and finding the main idea.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Use of smartboards for ELA instruction to increase student engagement within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Title I ELA intervention teacher leading data analysis and small group planning/interventions for ELA as well as model classroom/coaching cycles of best practice replication for teachers identified through walkthrough data completed by administration.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

Data disaggregation and small group planning based on literacy data may occur after school hours as needed.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SBJ students begin the school year one to two grade levels below proficiency in mathematics, with the common trend being that students struggle to apply mathematical skills and concepts to novel situations. Our students have difficulty approaching navigating the problem solving process, which includes choosing appropriate strategies and methods. Tremendous gains are made each year, but it is not enough to close these significant achievement gaps. While SBJ has increased its overall proficiency to 57% in 2023 from % in 2022, we are still far below our overall proficiency goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By demonstrating their understanding of math concepts by explaining or describing problem solving processes and strategies, then SBJ students will improve their overall mathematical proficiency by 8% (from 57% to 65%).

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for desired outcomes through ongoing data analysis of performance monitoring assessments, iReady and ALEKS diagnostics, common formative assessments, and Eureka Squared assessments. This monitoring will indicate when shifts in instructional practice, small group instruction, and/or interventions and enrichment are needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based strategies that will be implemented include small group instruction, progress monitoring, teacher modeling, visual representations, and monitoring and reflecting on the problem solving process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Exposing students to problems that are solved using multiple strategies enables students to become more efficient in selecting appropriate ways to solve math problems with greater ease and flexibility. Explaining relevant concepts and notation in the context of a problem-solving activity, prompting students to describe how worked examples are solved using mathematically valid explanations, and introducing algebraic notation systematically helps students develop new ways of reasoning, which will help them solve mathematical problems. Additionally, visual representations and teacher modeling allow students who have difficulty grasping the relationship between math representations and abstract symbols to understand this across math concepts and ideas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction. To support small group instruction in classrooms, The Title I Intervention teacher leading data analysis and small group planning/interventions for math as well as model classroom/coaching cycles of best practice replication. Additionally, Title I classroom assistants will assist with providing small group instruction cycles in classrooms .

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Using chromebooks and headphones to support the technology based supplemental programs to our core instruction and assist with quarterly progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Administration and Title I Math Coach will select the teachers exhibiting best practices focused on for the monthly look-for's to showcase as model classrooms for walkthroughs and also select 4 teachers that will benefit from observing best practices based upon the monthly walkthrough data cycles.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

Using chromebooks and headphones to support the technology based supplemental programs to our core instruction assist with quarterly progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Professional development for teachers and staff on problem solving, mathematical thinking and reasoning standards (MTRs), and discourse in the mathematics classroom to build teacher and student capacity for monitoring and reflecting on problem solving processes.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

All teachers will implement modeling by having students use appropriate tools to create concrete visual representations as evident in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work analysis in PLCs. Additional manipulatives and notebooks for interactive note taking during whole group and small group instruction will assist with students learning to master mathematical concepts with visual representations.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Observation cycles with teachers on campus to identify best practices. Title I Math intervention teacher leading data analysis and small group planning/interventions for Math as well as model classroom/coaching cycles of best practice replication for teachers identified through classroom walkthrough data from administration.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

All teachers will implement modeling by having students use appropriate tools to create concrete visual representations as evident in lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work analysis in PLCs. Additional manipulatives and notebooks for interactive note taking during whole group and small group instruction will assist with students learning to master mathematical concepts with visual representations.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Professional development centered around the book: Visual Learning for Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Jordan Ruckersfeldt (jordan.ruckersfeldt@myoneclay.net)

By When: Monthly

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although SBJ implements a positive behavior system with high student and teacher buy in, the number of discipline referrals nearly doubled from in 2022 to 78 in 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using actions and strategies related to student engagement and the continued implementation of our PBIS program, we will decrease our overall number of referrals from 78 to 40 or less by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored with a PBIS monthly newsletter to faculty and staff, and Synergy reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based interventions that will be implemented for this area of focus include engaging students in relevant learning, defining and teaching positive expectations, prompting and supervising skills, and creating and providing a continuum of response strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We already have an established and successful PBIS program at our school. The rationale of the selection of these evidence-based strategies is that we want to expand upon our current success, and amplify those positive practices already in place. Furthermore, the selection of these strategies will assist our students in transferring the positive behavior skills and life skills instilled in them at school into other facets of their lives, which will contribute to them being successful beyond the classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Actively engage students (provide high rates of varied opportunities to respond) in relevant learning and differentiate instruction to support all learners. 7 Mindsets mini booklets for new staff to receive along with initial PBIS training.

Person Responsible: Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Co-develop, define, posit, and explicitly teach a few (3-5) positive classroom expectations to enhance engagement. (PAWS-practice responsibility, act kind & respectful, work hard, & stay safe). book: Safe Circles from the 7 Mindsets store to be implemented after PD provided on specific life skill engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter

Weekly publications to parents through Smore and additional productions for students with Canva & SmartSuite.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Parent communication folders that are used to send home weekly communications, such as announcements, grades, conference requests, and data reports. Paper (pallet) for messaging of important events and provision of at-home resources. Poster maker paper, toner, and ink or consistent messaging and signage around campus displaying our PAWS expectations-especially the entry and exit of campus. Poster maker paper, toner, and ink or consistent messaging and signage around campus displaying our PAWS expectations-especially the entry and exit of campus.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly

Schoolwide signs displaying consistent messaging.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: As needed

Continue implementation of PBIS with specific enhancements to further differentiation the needs of all our learners to include students with disabilities and English language learners.

Person Responsible: Nancy Gleneski (nancy.gleneski@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Only 24% of ELL students were at or above proficiency on the 2023 FAST ELA assessment by the third progress monitoring assessment. Additionally, ACCESS testing indicates 11% of our ELL students show language proficiency, as indicated by their overall composite scores.

Measurable Outcome:

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

40% of ELL students will show proficiency by the end of year FAST assessment raising proficiency levels by 16%. With increased usage of Imagine Learning, we should expect to see the percentage of students increasing their overall composite scores from the previous year. ACCESS test scores and overall proficiency levels will rise 10%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focused will be monitored for the desired outcome through classroom walkthroughs, quarterly data reviews, monthly Literacy Leadership Team data reviews, weekly monitoring of Imagine Learning usage, and FAST assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

There are three evidence-based interventions that will be used for this area of focus. Small group instruction provided with the assistance of ELL classroom assistants to target data indicated areas of need and increase proficiency. Professional development opportunities to facilitate and assist language immersion and learning provided by the district ESOL department and school. ELL dictionaries for scholars to access and utilize as they work towards fluency of language and content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supplementing learning from the school day and providing targeted assistance to students whose needs extend beyond what they can receive in the classroom instruction must be focused and targeted. Closely aligning the content and pacing of instruction with student needs will result in better student performance. Determining the right level of difficulty and pace and the most appropriate skills to teach is critical to effectively individualizing instruction. Small group instruction is a promising strategy. Collective efficacy provided through professional development is ranked as the number one factor influencing student achievement. Ensuring students know how to utilize ELL dictionaries are a way to explicitly teach vocabulary. The National Reading Panel (NRP) stated that vocabulary plays an important role both in learning to read and in comprehending text: readers cannot understand text without knowing what most of the words mean.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional development opportunities on best practices for working with ELL students and monitoring program usage of Imagine learning.

Person Responsible: Mary Taylor (mary.taylor@myoneclay.net)

By When: As needed

Weekly usage monitoring of the Imagine Learning program to ensure all students meet the 60 minutes per week requirement.

Person Responsible: Debbie Chapman (debbie.chapman@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Data is deeply disaggregated on a monthly basis by sub groups and standards due to the rise of various sub group populations over the recent years, such as English Language Learners and students with identified learning disabilities. Title I funds are utilized to ensure we are allocating funded personnel to support intentional small group instruction that is data driven to close learning gaps in foundational skills and leverage learning outcomes. Based upon recent data discussions, an additional teaching assistant allocation was added for the year. Positions are frequently adjusted based upon student data and the needs indicated for support. The way funds, personnel, and resources are allocated are utilized is also discussed at School Advisory Council meetings with teachers, support, parents, and community members to glean useful insight from all stakeholders in the education process.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 2023 PM 3 FAST data, Kindergarten was 42% below proficiency, 1st grade was 42% below proficiency, and 2nd grade was 47% below proficiency.

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

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST data, third grade had 49% of students below proficiency and fourth grade had 31% below proficiency. Fifth grade had 52% of students performing below proficiency scoring a level 1 and level 2 in ELA.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST data, less than 50% of students in K-2 were below proficiency. Our goal for 2024 will be to reduce this number by the end of the year and close foundational gaps so that only 10% of these students are below proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on 2023 PM 3 FAST data, the 5th grade student cohort was of particular concern with only 48% proficiency. Our goal for 2024 PM 3 is for 60% of 5th grade students to show proficiency, which will elevate 3-5 ELA proficiency to 65% proficiency.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly PLCs

Quarterly data meetings

Classroom Walkthroughs

Lexia Core 5 and weekly data reviews

FAST Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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. §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?

SRA Decoding and Comprehension are provided through direct explicit instruction as interventions to close instructional gaps.

Weekly PLCs to create common formative assessments, analyze student data, and refine instructional practices are consistent and collaborative.

Small group differentiated instruction based on individual student indicated needs closes gaps to leverage proficiency.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

PLCs improve instructional practices and leverage student achievement. Data reviews increase the effectiveness of small group and differentiation practices to individualize student learning based upon need. Small group instruction provides focused, intensive interventions for identified students at risk for reading deficiencies to close learning gaps and elevate proficiency levels.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning and Assessment- Teachers are utilizing district ELA supports through weekly PLCs specifically focusing on creating common formative assessments for all ELA classrooms. The assessments are built based upon standards and then student data is analyzed using the TACA protocol to determined mastery and next steps for instruction among the team.	Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net
Literacy Leadership and Literacy Coaching- ELA teachers are provided professional development on the science of reading and specific county based interventions (such as SRA Decoding and Comprehension) that support direct, explicit, systematic instruction to leverage student learning outcomes. The progress made by students receiving these interventions for significant reading deficiencies is reviewed on at least a monthly basis by our school Literacy Leadership Team to ensure progress is made and determine next steps and suggestions for teams.	Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net
Literacy Coaching and Professional Learning- Teachers will participate in cycles of model classroom walkthroughs to view best practice instruction that can be replicated throughout campus. They will have time set aside to discuss and debrief after viewing the instructional practices and plan prior to returning for implementation in their classrooms.	Taylor, Mary, mary.taylor@myoneclay.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school disseminates the school improvement plan during our initial School Advisory Council meeting of the new school year. The SAC revisits the SIP throughout the year to monitor progress towards goals. Additionally, the SIP is shared during the annual Title I parent meeting, which is held in conjunction with

the school's Open House. The information in this meeting is shared digitally for families who cannot attend in person. A paper copy of the SIP can be found in the front office in the school's Title I binder. A digital copy of the SIP is available via the school's webpage, under the Title I Resources tab: <https://sbj.myoneclay.net/>.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Much like the School Improvement Plan, the school's Family Engagement Plan is disseminated in a variety of methods to ensure everyone has access to it. The plan is shared and monitored throughout the year at School Advisory Council meetings; it is shared at the annual Title I parent meeting; and it is shared in the Title I binder in the front office. A digital copy of the Family Engagement Plan is available via the school's webpage, under the Title I Resources tab: <https://sbj.myoneclay.net/>.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school through the achievement of the ELA, Math, PBIS, and ESSA goals outlined in this School Improvement Plan. By incorporating a variety of action steps, teaching strategies, and professional development opportunities, our teachers will have a higher capacity for providing an enriched and accelerated curriculum. The three main components of this plan are strong Professional Learning Communities, the implementation of monthly teacher observation cycles, and the monthly meetings of our PBIS and Literacy Leadership committees. These components will ensure that teachers are implementing action steps with fidelity, and that student progress is being monitored carefully and responded to accordingly to ensure maximum growth.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan was not developed in coordination or integration with other Federal, State, or local services.