Ocean Palms Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ocean Palms Elementary School

355 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

http://www-ope.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Cantwell

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	5%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A
	2016-17: A
	2015-16: A
	2014-15: A
	2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

At Ocean Palms we inspire students to explore and develop their strengths and passions. We focus on integrity, leadership, and service above self. We commit to fostering a positive, safe, nurturing environment with an emphasis on academic rigor, the arts, athletics, and technology within a vibrant, caring community.
- Our focus is the whole child.

School Motto - Everyday. Everyone. Everything matters!

Provide the school's vision statement

Ocean Palms Elementary is where students become leaders:

Lead by example
Encourage others
Accepts challenges
Do the right thing
Explore their passions
Reflect on learning
Strive for academic excellence

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cantwell, Tiffany	Principal	The Core Leadership Team is designated as a working group consisting of the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, School Counselor, and School Psychologist. They provide data on RtI/MTSS procedures and goals as well as input regarding academic and behavioral areas that need to be addressed and levels of support for students. The Leadership Team receives annual training from the district and continues to receive ongoing training throughout the year. Professional Development for RtI/MTSS is conducted for the staff on an ongoing basis. The Leadership Team then evaluates additional staff professional development needs during weekly PLC meetings throughout the year.
Morgan, Brian	Assistant Principal	
Andreu, Rita	Instructional Coach	
Howell, Kristine	Psychologist	
Pellegrino, Olivia	Guidance Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	91	89	99	82	104	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	1	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	86%	75%	57%	87%	72%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	67%	58%	66%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	59%	53%	58%	50%	48%
Math Achievement	90%	77%	63%	92%	77%	62%
Math Learning Gains	72%	69%	62%	76%	67%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	59%	51%	72%	58%	47%
Science Achievement	85%	72%	53%	82%	68%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
Number of students enrolled	91 (0)	89 (0)	99 (0)	82 (0)	104 (0)	91 (0)	556 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (1)	1 (8)	1 (1)	1 (1)	3 (0)	6 (4)	15 (15)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	2 (2)	4 (10)	7 (13)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	90%	78%	12%	58%	32%
	2018	91%	78%	13%	57%	34%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	77%	6%	58%	25%
	2018	84%	74%	10%	56%	28%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-8%					
05	2019	86%	76%	10%	56%	30%
	2018	87%	73%	14%	55%	32%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	90%	82%	8%	62%	28%
	2018	94%	80%	14%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	82%	10%	64%	28%
	2018	91%	83%	8%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					
05	2019	87%	80%	7%	60%	27%
	2018	87%	79%	8%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	85%	73%	12%	53%	32%
	2018	80%	73%	7%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	62	68	67	65	59	61	64				
ASN	75	64		81	64						
HSP	100			82							
WHT	87	71	75	91	73	71	85				
FRL	60			60							

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	67	55	44	74	66	64	54				
ASN	95	65		97	90		100				
HSP	75	56		100	67						
MUL	95	77		95	92						
WHT	87	66	57	91	75	72	82				
FRL	73	50		73	57						

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	550
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	64
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	91
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
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
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	79
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Students identified in the lowest quartile in mathematics showed the least amount of learning gains in 2019. During the 2017-18 school year grade levels met every six weeks and solely focused on mathematics data and instruction resulting in a ten percent increase. However, during the 2018-19 school year the focus shifted to weekly PLC meetings targeting ELA.

Lowest Quartile Data in Mathematics
2019 - 70%

2018 - 72%
2017 - 62%

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

Overall learning gains in mathematics showed a 4% decrease in 2019. During the 2017-18 school year grade levels met every six weeks and solely focused on mathematics data and instruction resulting in a ten percent increase. However, during the 2018-19 school year the focus shifted to weekly PLC meetings targeting ELA.

Learning Gains in Mathematics
2019 - 72%
2018 - 76%
2017 - 71%

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

Our school performed higher than the state average in every category.

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

Overall learning gains in ELA increased by 5% and students identified in the lowest quartile demonstrated the greatest improvement in ELA with an increase of 18%.

ELA Learning Gains 66% to 71%
ELA Lowest Quartile Gains 58% to 76%

Last year every teacher collaborated within a PLC to develop and administer common formative and summative assessments in ELA to guide real-time instruction. All assessments administered are aligned with state standards and are consistent in format and rigor with those used by other teachers in the PLC. Teachers assessed student learning on a consistent and equitable basis. Teachers used results from common assessments to make decisions for future changes in content, instruction, and assessments. Teachers planned for students to receive extra support and enrichment opportunities. All students are guaranteed access to this systematic intervention regardless of the teacher to whom they are assigned. There was an additional focus on the implementation and effectiveness of an assigned intervention/enrichment block built into the master schedule for ELA.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our goal is for every child to demonstrate proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). We will continue to increase our Tier 1 interventions and monitor students' progress through iReady to identify areas of concern and provide supports.

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

1. Our goal is to increase our overall proficiency by 3% in Mathematics by focusing on learning gains for all students through the use of common assessments and targeted differentiated instruction as measured by the FSA in 2020.

2. Our goal is to increase our overall proficiency by 3% in ELA by focusing on learning gains for all students through the use of common assessments and targeted differentiated instruction as measured by the FSA in 2020.

3. Students will be recognized for demonstrating good character through our school-wide Positive Behavior System (PBS).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Positive Behavior System
Rationale	Students will be recoginized for demonstrating good character through our school-wide Positive Behavior System (PBS). Through PBS, teachers and staff are modeling and teaching school-wide behavior expectations to foster a positive learning environment, maximize instructional minutes, and reward students for demonstrating the six Pillars of Character: Citizenship, Responsibility,Trustworthiness, Fairness, Caring and Respect.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Staff actively monitors students' behavior rewarding them with positive PAWS, verbal praise, and/or redirecting student behavior, as needed, to foster student-teacher and student-student relationships.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	All staff members will distribute Positive PAWS to students who follow school-wide expectations and the six Pillars of Character. Students submit their Positive PAWS to the library weekly to be entered into a grade level raffle. Every week two students from each grade level are recognized on the news for their behavior. These students receive SWAG tags in recognition of their achievement. As an additional incentive, five students from every grade level are selected to go to the Otter Outpost school store. Students are also recognized for their leadership and positive behavior through our Character Counts recognition program. One student from each class is selected each month to receive a Character Counts award and attend our Character Counts assembly with their family members.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Administration will monitor the effectiveness of the system through observation and discipline data. During classroom visits administration will be looking for the following strategies to promote positive behavior: • View behaviors like academics – something to be taught • Focus on changing and teaching behavior • Focus on effective prevention • Focus on Positive climate (Teacher-student relationship) • Teachers directly instruct and model behavior expectations and rules • Classroom rules and expectations are posted in classrooms • Teachers establish routines and procedures
Action Step	
Description	1. School-wide expectations and a common language has been developed and implemented by all staff members. 2. All staff members attended a PBS training during pre-planning to review protocols and procedures. 3. Students attended an assembly the first week of school to review school-wide expectation, rewards, and consequences. 4. Teachers use the PBS to develop individual positive behavior systems for their classrooms. Those plans are submitted and reviewed by administration. 5. Behavior data is monitored weekly at Core Team Meetings.

6. Behavior supports and training are provided throughout the school year to students and staff.

Person Responsible	Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	If we deliver effective instruction using current data to meet the needs of all students, then we will increase learning gains and over proficiency in Mathematics.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase our overall proficiency by 3% in Mathematics by focusing on learning gains for all students through the use of common assessments, tracking student progress, conferencing and goal setting with students, and targeted differentiated instruction as measured by the FSA in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use formative assessments to identify students' current levels of performance and create a system for tracking their progress toward their overall learning targets. Teachers will monitor each student's progress and conference with students to make them aware of their progress. Teachers will provide specific feedback to students regarding formative data as it relates to standards/learning targets. Teachers will implement a systematic, ongoing process to provide feedback to students, and use a variety of ways to celebrate progress toward learning targets. Teachers will also organize and monitor all students into appropriate groups to facilitate the processing of content. Teachers will identify specific instructional strategies and how they use them to differentiate instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies outlined above are based upon the meta-analysis of research on instruction and proven practices from Dr. Robert Marzano. Each teacher and grade level will produce an action plan for these practices. Evidence will be monitored through monthly classroom observations and artifacts will be reviewed quarterly by administration.

Action Step	
Description	1. Grade levels will meet in their weekly PLC meetings to review data and share best practices related to the Art and Science of Teaching Framework by Dr. Marzano. 2. Teachers will develop and submit action plans to administration for review and feedback. 3. Teachers will implement and monitor their action plans using student data and artifacts. 4. Administration will monitor action plans monthly during observations and quarterly when teachers submit students' artifacts.
Person Responsible	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	If we deliver effective instruction using current data to meet the needs of all students, then we will increase learning gains and over proficiency in ELA.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase our overall proficiency by 3% in ELA by focusing on learning gains for all students through the use of common assessments, tracking student progress, conferencing and goal setting with students, and targeted differentiated instruction as measured by the FSA in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use formative assessments to identify students' current levels of performance and create a system for tracking their progress toward their overall learning targets. Teachers will monitor each student's progress and conference with students to make them aware of their progress. Teachers will provide specific feedback to students regarding formative data as it relates to standards/learning targets. Teachers will implement a systematic, ongoing process to provide feedback to students, and use a variety of ways to celebrate progress toward learning targets. Teachers will also organize and monitor all students into appropriate groups to facilitate the processing of content. Teachers will identify specific instructional strategies and how they use them to differentiate instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies outlined above are based upon the meta-analysis of research on instruction and proven practices from Dr. Robert Marzano. Each teacher and grade level will produce an action plan for these practices. Evidence will be monitored through monthly classroom observations and artifacts will be reviewed quarterly by administration.

Action Step	
Description	1. Grade levels will meet in their weekly PLC meetings to review data and share best practices related to the Art and Science of Teaching Framework by Dr. Marzano. 2. Teachers will develop and submit action plans to administration for review and feedback. 3. Teachers will implement and monitor their action plans using student data and artifacts. 4. Administration will monitor action plans monthly during observations and quarterly when teachers submit students' artifacts.
Person Responsible	Tiffany Cantwell (tiffany.cantwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

N/A