

Duval County Public Schools

Southside Estates Elementary School



2020-21 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	26

Southside Estates Elementary School

9775 IVEY RD, Jacksonville, FL 32246

<http://www.duvalschools.org/ssee>

Demographics

Principal: Teresa Dowdell Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Duval 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Southside Estates Elementary School

9775 IVEY RD, Jacksonville, FL 32246

<http://www.duvalschools.org/ssee>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">63%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

At Southside Estates Elementary we empower students and teachers to create a positive community where all stakeholders are involved in and held accountable for the quality education of every student as it impacts their lives academically and socially

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Southside Estates Elementary School is to equip students with the necessary skills to become high achieving life long learners, productive community members and responsible citizens

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dowdell-Brown, Teresa	Principal	Oversees all aspects of MTSS, delegates responsibilities and ensures that all staff are implementing MTSS. Communicates with School Advisory Council (SAC) regarding the MTSS process. In conjunction with regular collaboration and debriefs with Instructional Coaches and Interventionist, shares pertinent information with faculty and staff, directs and approves all professional development to ensure that it is aligned with the district mandates, state requirements, federal policies and procedures, and the needs of teachers to meet the needs of children. All final decisions on hiring and ways of work are part of her responsibility. Maintaining a culture and climate that is safe for employees and children, participating in the Shared Decision process as a voting member of the shared Decision Committee, and monitoring instruction with fidelity are her main areas of focus.
Weertz, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Principal designee, updates and provides data to faculty, primary responsibility is to support the work of the Principal and to follow through on duties assigned to her as she learns the many facets of leadership. Responsible for professional development, technology, testing, public relations, campus security, cafeteria, and events. Monitors safety nets and MTSS programs. Oversees text books, SIP, Title I, PTA, Math and Science. Participates in SAC and PTA.
Cauley, Melba	Instructional Coach	Plans interventions in reading and assists in developing intervention plans. Provides professional development to teachers regarding Florida Standards Common Core and tiered instruction. Supports teachers in developing and implementing their IPDPs. Utilizes differentiated instruction at students' learning ability in Grade 3 with small groups or one-on-one.
Petrilla, Holly	Instructional Coach	Plans interventions in math and assists in developing intervention plans. Provides professional development to teachers regarding Florida Standards Common Core and tiered instruction. Supports teachers in developing and implementing their IPDPs. Utilizes differentiated instruction at students learning ability in Grade 2-5 with small groups or one-on-one.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/8/2020, Teresa Dowdell Brown

Number of teachers with a 2019 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 2019 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

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	83	73	61	64	69	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425
Attendance below 90 percent	42	18	12	22	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	42	47	43	36	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	48	46	0	43	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175

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	45	46	40	35	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	77	68	54	59	70	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	

Number of students enrolled	77	68	54	59	70	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	48%	50%	57%	52%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	69%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	67%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	67%	62%	63%	69%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	63%	62%	66%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	51%	57%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	48%	53%	55%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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
03	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
	2018	33%	49%	-16%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	31%	50%	-19%	56%	-25%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison				-15%		
Cohort Comparison				-9%		

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	49%	-12%	53%	-16%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison				-19%		
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	41	33	45	64	41	36				
ELL	35	52	62	63	86	73	50				
ASN	68	50		75	67						
BLK	34	57	55	60	70		7				
HSP	43	48	67	62	84	80	45				
MUL	30			90							
WHT	58	52		68	66	40	55				
FRL	47	49	45	64	70	57	30				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	30	46	64	30	30	36	40				
ELL	33	44		58	47						
ASN	81			88							
BLK	37	47	69	55	42	46	53				
HSP	42	43		62	57						
WHT	54	63		68	49		56				
FRL	47	52	55	62	52	48	59				
2017 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	20	58	62	35	56	57	21				
ELL	27	60		59	60						
BLK	48	73	53	68	67	64	42				
HSP	43	69		57	65	50	50				
WHT	56	63		75	57		70				

2017 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
FRL	49	68	67	66	67	60	52				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
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	65
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	51
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.

1. The lowest performing component is the 2019 Science results that indicates a 17-point decline compared to the 2018 FCAT Science NGSS Results. Additionally, the ELA Cohort data reflects ELA reflects a 24-point decrease in reading proficiency compared to 2018

FSA Data. There are many causes that impacted the 2019 FCAT Science Results
A large percentage of students reading below grade level
Implementation of a new Science Curriculum
A novice teacher new to teaching 5th Grade Science
Lack of background knowledge for students
Limited instructional time to teach the science curriculum
Lack of explicit professional development to make certain teachers had a thorough understanding of teaching the Science Standards with fidelity

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

ELA Lowest performing students had the next largest decline from 59% (2018) to 48%(2019). There are several factors that have contributed to this decline:
As a result of a decrease in school Title 1 funds resulted in the loss of a Reading Interventionist to provide additional support to the lowest performing students.

With the exception of 1 ELA teacher all teachers were either new to the school or the grade level
Teachers were learning the standards and instructional delivery to provide students with Instructional
Lack of professional development for Varying Exceptional teachers contributed to the decline of the lowest performing students

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.

Science Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This is a direct correlation to our reading achievement results.

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

Math demonstrated improvement in all three subgroups. Southside Estates took the following actions:
-Professional development focusing on differentiated instruction, analyzing student work and maximizing the instructional block
-Students taking ownership of their learning by tracking their data and participating in monthly data chats
-Implementation of Thinking Maps
- Implementing small group instruction based on the needs of students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

- 1.Learning gains in ELA - Students with disability are not making learning gains on annual assessment
- 2 ELL Students - Implementing a solid plan of action to make certain ELL students receives ongoing support and remediation to increase their chances on demonstrating learning gains on the FSA Assessments.

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

1. Learning Gains and increasing Reading proficiency
2. Increasing learning gains with lowest performing students
3. Increase Science proficiency with 5th Grade Students
4. Create an engaging learning environment
- 5

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Overall, students with disabilities decreased in all components of the English Language Arts Assessment. According to the 2019 ELA Florida Standards Assessment, Students With Disabilities have decreased eleven points in Reading Achievement. In the Spring of 2019, 33% of students with disabilities were proficient readers compared to the 21% of proficient readers in 2019. Additionally, there was a drastic decrease of twenty-nine points in the lowest performing students demonstrating gains on the Florida Standards Assessment. Moreover, there was a 5 point decrease in the overall students with disabilities demonstrating learning gains on the Florida Standards Assessment. Lastly, 2019 FSA Science New Generations Standards indicates that students disabilities decreased from 40% in 2018 to 36% in 2019. Overall, students with disabilities must receive explicit instruction that is aligned to their instructional needs. If students with disabilities make learning gains then there will be in an increase in student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

If students with disabilities receive explicit instruction based on their individual needs according to their data, then there will be in an increase of students with disabilities scoring proficient on all Florida Standards Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Development for Varying Exceptional Teachers and general education teachers is key in making in making certain certain students with disabilities are engaged in explicit instruction. According to the U.S. Department of Education, "research confirms that teachers are the single most important accompany for higher standards for students for students and greater accountability for student learning, and professional development is a critical link among new policies, school reform, and improved practice."(Knapp, 2003). When teachers have the opportunity to learn, implement the newly learned strategy, and receive feedback; it will result in student learning.

1. Varying Exceptional Teachers will engage in continuous coaching Cycles to provide students with disabilities with explicit instruction based on their needs. Additionally teachers will be engaged in analyzing data and planning for instruction to address students misconceptions.

.2. Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery will be implemented to close the learning gaps of all students with disabilities. Reading Coach will conduct monthly professional development to assist with planning and instructional delivery of Corrective Instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

3. Accelerated Reader will be implemented to provide students with a strategy to increase their stamina and practice improving their reading comprehension. Teachers will conference with students monthly to set new learning goals.

4. Acaletics is a researched method of math instruction teaches students that the preparation required to be a good athlete is what is necessary to be a good student. Frequent walk-throughs will be conducted to monitor the implementation of Acaletics. This will be monitored through monthly assessments.

5. Math Coach and Varying Exceptional Teachers will implement the use of math manipulative to enhance students understanding of real world problems and basic math

concepts. In addition, the Math and Reading Coach will use Coach Performance Success and Extra Support books to address students instructional needs. Lastly, Reflex Math will be used to help students master their basic facts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development will be provided to Varying Exceptional Teachers and Instructional Coach by administration and ESE Lead focusing on lesson planning, data analysis, scaffolding the standards, small group instruction, on the needs of the students during Common Planning, Professional Learning Communities and Early Release Days professional development.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

2. All classroom teachers will receive professional development on providing students with accommodations during the instructional delivery, class work and assessments

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

Implement Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading with coaching from Houghton Mifflin and school based coach with fidelity.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

4. Quarterly data chats and parent conferences with students and parents of students with disabilities and lowest performing students to monitor their learning.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

5. Administration will conduct frequent focus walks using the Standards Walk Through Protocol to monitor the implementation of small group standards based instruction. Professional development will be developed based on data collected during the walk through.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

All teachers providing Math instruction will implement the use of math manipulatives to enhance students understanding of real world problems and basic math concepts. In addition, 3rd - 5th grade math teachers will use Coach Performance Success and Extra Support books to address students instructional needs.

Person Responsible Andrea Weertz (weertza@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Over the past two years, there is lack of students demonstrating learning gains and there was no growth in the component Reading Achievement. According to the 2019 ELA Florida Standards Assessment there was a four

Description and Rationale: point decrease in students demonstrating learning gains on the Florida State Standards Assessment. Additionally, there was an 11 point decrease in the lowest performing students demonstrating learning gains. Although there was Math increased in all components. It is essential that strategies are implemented to continue this positive trend.

Measurable Outcome: If all teachers gain a full understanding of standards to implement the curriculum with fidelity, then there will be a significant increase by all students, including students with disabilities, in making learning gains on the English Language Arts and Mathematics Florida State Standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The Gradual Release Model will be implemented in all core subjects to engage students in the instructional delivery. In brief, the gradual release of responsibility model is that in which over the progression of the lesson, the teacher becomes less and less involved and the student takes more ownership over the content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this strategy revolves around the concept of the frame work. The framework consist of an " I do, We do and you" Students will be provided with explicit instruction from the teacher explicitly modeling the learning expectation. This strategy is effective for all learners because it increases student ownership and as the cycles progresses students gain confidence as learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with professional development in understanding standards and aligning standards to the curriculum, building learning arcs, analyzing student work utilizing protocols, utilizing Thinking Maps, during Common Planning, Early Release Day Professional Development and Grade Level Professional Learning Community

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

School Leadership will conduct frequent walk through utilizing the Standards Walk Through Protocol to monitor the fidelity of students. Reading and Math Coach will develop professional development based on teachers instructional needs.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

Implement Reading Mastery (K-2nd Grade) and Corrective Reading (3rd -5th Grade) to meet needs of all students. The effectiveness of instruction will be measured through walk-throughs and lesson checks.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

According to the 2019 FCAT New Generations Science Assessment there was a 19 point decrease in Science Achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

If Science was taught with fidelity in Kindergarten - 5th Grade and teachers had a thorough understanding of the standards then there will be an increase in 5th Grade Science Achievement on the Florida Comprehensive Science New Generation Science Assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The Gradual Release Model will be implemented in all core subjects to engage students in the instructional delivery. In brief, the gradual release of responsibility model is that in which over the progression of the lesson, the teacher becomes less and less involved and the student takes more and more ownership over the content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The rationale for selecting this strategy revolves around the concept of the frame work. The framework consist of an " I do, We do and you" Students will be provided with explicit instruction from the teacher explicitly modeling the learning expectation. This strategy is effective for all learners because it increases student ownership and as the cycles progresses students gain confidence as learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with professional development in understanding standards, lesson planning, explicit instruction, implementing all components of a lab, analyzing student work and integrating Science in all content areas.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Conduct Focus Walks on Science instruction utilizing the Standards Walk Through Protocol and implement Coaching Cycles as needed

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration will collaborate with Science Teachers to implement a focus calendar and implement benchmark assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

Science Acaletics and Penda will be implemented in 5th grade to review all standards that will assessed on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Generation Science Assessment,

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

School wide implementation of Scholastic Reads to increase background knowledge of Science content at all grade levels.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Establishing positive relationships with students and all stakeholders is essential for students to reach their maximum potential. According to the 5 ESSENTIALS results, only 41% of the faculty strongly agree that all teachers play a role in disciplining all students. Moreover, 31% on the teachers feel responsible for helping all students develop self control. In addition, the 5 Essential Survey reveals, only 27% of 4th and 5th grade students feel safe at school. Moreover, only 31% of the students in 4th and 5th grade feel safe in the hallways, 21% feel safe in the bathroom and 33% feel very safe and outside of school.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers establish a positive, safe, and engaging learning environment for all students and stakeholders, then all learners will be engaged in high quality learning experiences resulting in an increase in student achievement

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Sanford Harmony will be implemented in all classrooms Pre-Kindergarten - 5th Grade to enhance relationships with peers, and build positive relationships with teachers that result in a positive learning culture for all students. Additionally, Calm Classroom is being implemented to address the socio-economic needs of all students. Calm Classroom provides practical mindfulness-based tools to help us manage stress and achieve emotional well-being throughout the day by activating the body's relaxation response. When we're feeling focused, relaxed and energized, we are empowered.

Calm classroom mindfulness-based techniques provide skills needed to create a calmer learning environment for students and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Sanford Harmony will not only build positive relationships but it will also address the emotional needs of every student. Sanford Harmony allow students to compliment one another as well as have positive interactions during the Meet Up, The class works together to strive for their goals that are center of their circle time. Additionally, the Buddy System will implemented o increase student collaboration as well as provide support when needed during various planned activities throughout the school day.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide ongoing professional development for teachers and students on building positive relationships through the implementation of Sanford Harmony, Restorative Practices, Calm Classroom and the 5 to 1 ratio.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implement Sanford Harmony and Calm Classroom with fidelity to ensure all students have a positive learning culture.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Analyze discipline and positive referral data at the beginning of the faculty meetings. Additionally the MTSS team will meet monthly to analyze and problem solve as a team to decrease discipline referrals.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

All faculty, staff and students will be provided professional development on implementing safety procedures aligned with the Florida Standards Safe School Plan. The plan will be reviewed quarterly with students and monthly with the faculty and staff during Faculty Meetings. The PBIS will hold monthly meetings to review the data and look for trends. Additionally, the PBIS Team will develop a student lead Safety Team to address student safety concerns.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the Standards Walk Through Dashboard for the 2019-2020 school year, the average rating for assessing instruction was a 2.7. Over 70% of the assessments that took place during instruction were not aligned to rigor of FSA Assessments. Additionally, 0.5 of lessons taught by classroom teachers were not aligned to Learning Arc. Overall, only, 0.3 of lessons observed demonstrated mastery of the standards. In addition, the 5 Essentials data reflect that there is a need of increased collaboration of teachers during professional development (Common Planning, and PLC's). Only 35% (52) of teachers reviewed assessment data with other teachers to make instructional decisions.

Measurable Outcome: All faculty and staff will engage in effective planning procedures to ensure instruction and assessments align to the level of proficiency of the standards/FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: In backward planning, teachers focus their attention on: (1) knowing the curriculum standards; (2) creating formative and summative (in-class) assessments and reviewing and analyzing state- and district-required assessments to meet the needs of all students; and then (3) designing lessons that integrate these standards and assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Backwards Planning will create a road map that will result in teachers progressing and teaching the entire standard. This planning process builds in opportunities for teachers for teacher to unpack and build their Learning Arc's, build assessments aligned to the standards and plan rigorous instruction. I strongly believe this result in an increase student achievement levels in all core subjects.

Action Steps to Implement

The Leadership Team will facilitate Common Planning utilizing the Backwards Planning Design in all core subject areas with all grade levels. Early release and professional development will focus on building Learning Arcs , analyzing student work and planning for standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

Conduct frequent walk throughs using the Standards Walk Through Protocol to measure the effectiveness of the planning process and the instructional delivery. Professional development will be planned based on data collected from walk-throughs.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

Instructional Coaches will lead teachers in the process of analyzing student work utilizing various protocols to identify misconceptions of learning and what students are able to successfully do. Lesson plans will be created/revised based on the needs of students.

Person Responsible Andrea Weertz (weertza@duvalschools.org)

Monthly Professional Learning Communities will conduct Instructional Rounds to collect evidence. provide teachers with feedback and plan for i standards based instruction based on data collected during Instructional Rounds. The Learning Arcs will be the center of of collaboration and focus.

Person Responsible Melba Cauley (cauleym@duvalschools.org)

The Leadership Team will lead teachers in a book study/ professional articles that are focused on Standards Based Instruction. PLC 's Teams will collaborate and apply newly learned knowledge during common planning and the instructional delivery

Person Responsible Michelle Hylton (hyltonm@duvalschools.org)

Data from the Standards Protocol will be displayed and for all faculty and staff during faculty meetings, Professional Learning Communities ,and Common Planning. Teachers and administration will continuously collaborate and create action steps to improve instruction.

Person Responsible Teresa Dowdell-Brown (dowdell-bt@duvalschools.org)

#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Leadership Team will facilitate a book talk arou

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Increased Student Engagement: Teachers will utilize interactive Carts to maximize student engagement and students ownership during the instructional delivery through the use of the Student Response System.

Additional Support for Lowest Performing Students/ Students With Disabilities: Part-time tutors will be hired to provide additional support for students during the school day. On grade level students will be invited to participate in after -school tutoring.

Additional Reading Support: Full -Time Media will be utilized to enhance and motivate students to increase reading habits and as an intervention to address reading standards.

Teacher Retention Plan:

Goal: If there is a positive culture that fosters positive relationships and teachers feel valued then teacher retention will increase at the school level.

Action Plan:

- 1. Implement an Empowering Teachers Professional Learning Community for teachers to engage in teacher-led professional development**
- 2. Implement Celebrations of all faculty and staff in the weekly newsletter, beginning of faculty meetings and during surprise visits during Grade Level Meetings**
- 3. Create quarterly surveys aligned to the 5 Essentials Survey to monitor the effectiveness of the culture and make adjustments according to the feedback from surveys.**

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Establishing positive relationships with students and all stakeholders is essential for students to reach their maximum potential. According to the 5 ESSENTIALS results, there was a 19 point increase compared to 2019 5 Essentials reflecting the faculty strongly agree that all teachers play a role in disciplining all students. Additionally 61% of felt responsible to help each other do their best. Additionally, 88% of the students in 4th and 4th grade feel respected by their classroom teacher. 96% of students (4th and 5th grade) feel safe and comfortable at Southside Estates.

Southside Estates will continue to build a positive school culture for teachers, students and all stakeholders. Southside Estates has implemented Calm Classroom and Sanford Harmony to address the Social and Emotional needs of all students. Additionally, the school has built strong ritual and routines centered around PBIS Systems.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$4,254.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1380	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0761 - Southside Estates Elem. School	Title, I Part A	240.0	\$4,254.00
			<i>Notes: Accelerated Reader is being purchased to motivate students to read, build comprehension and fluency.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$3,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3240	359-Technology-Related Repairs and Maintenance	0761 - Southside Estates Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$3,600.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers will provide with professional development utilizing Thinking Maps to reach the needs of all students.</i>			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$7,854.00