

Duval County Public Schools

Hidden Oaks 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Hidden Oaks Elementary School

6127 CEDAR HILLS BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

www.duvalschools.org/hiddenoaks

Demographics

Principal: Lawanda Polydore

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Hidden Oaks Elementary School

6127 CEDAR HILLS BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

www.duvalschools.org/hiddenoaks

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>86%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

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.

Stonewall Jackson Elementary School's mission is to provide all children with a safe and supportive learning environment in which they will receive quality instruction and high-quality learning experiences that would help them achieve academic success in all future endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Stonewall Jackson Elementary is to provide all students with qualitative standard-based instruction that will prepare them to experience success in a competitive world that is culturally diverse and technologically advanced.

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
Platts, Shawn	Principal	
Rowan-Thomas, Regina	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/22/2020, Lawanda Polydore

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.*

1

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

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	0	47	48	66	34	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	247
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	2	2	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

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	3	51	48	58	42	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	16	16	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	20	28	33	31	34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170

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	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	3	51	48	58	42	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	16	16	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	20	28	33	31	34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170

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	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	31%	50%	57%	27%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	42%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	62%	63%	55%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	63%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	51%	48%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	22%	48%	53%	27%	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	30%	51%	-21%	58%	-28%
	2018	45%	50%	-5%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	20%	49%	-29%	56%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	18%	50%	-32%	56%	-38%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	61%	-23%	62%	-24%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	64%	-21%	64%	-21%
	2018	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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	23	31		27	23						
ELL	10										
BLK	31	55	44	40	58	56	20				
HSP	30										
WHT	37	55		63	64						
FRL	33	56	43	42	56	43	19				

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	19	15		19	46						
BLK	32	30	17	47	55	27	39				
WHT	25	27		65	53						
FRL	32	26	15	46	59	50	34				

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	10	40		30							
BLK	23	42	41	48	55	50	20				
WHT	30	33		70	73						
FRL	25	41	57	51	56	40	19				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	10
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
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	42
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.

5th Grade Science showed the lowest performance with 22%. This sub-group of students was our lowest-performing students as it relates to ELA Proficiency.

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

5th Grade Science showed the lowest performance with 22%. This sub-group of students was our lowest-performing students as it relates to ELA Proficiency.

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.

5th grade Science had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average is 53% and the school had 22% (-31%).

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

Bottom Quartile students in ELA showed the most improvement as we increased from 20% to 50% (+30%). We identified this sub-group of students early on in the school year and developed an Action Plan specific to the learning needs of these students. These students were pulled for additional support via small group pullout and push-in.

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

Students with less than 90% attendance is an area of concern.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. 5th Grade Science
4. BQ ELA
5. BQ Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA Language Arts proficiency scores experienced a 1% decrease for the 2018-2019 school year while our BQ ELA students experienced a 30% increase from 2017-2018 (20%) to 2018-2019 (50%). Teachers must have additional support to provide rigorous, grade level standards based instruction for students. This instruction must also be differentiated based on the individual needs of students.
If we focused on standards-based grade-level instruction and differentiated this instruction based on the individual needs of students, student achievement will increase.

If we focused on standards-based grade-level instruction and differentiated this instruction based on the individual needs of students, student achievement will increase.

Measurable Outcome: The intended outcome is for all students to receive standards-based instruction daily via the whole group as well as a small group to decrease both reading and writing deficiencies. An area that this can be accomplished through PD, explicitly teaching teachers and support staff on how to unpack standards to ensure lesson activities are aligned with state standard requirements for students to demonstrate standard mastery. In addition to PD, additional supplemental materials and programs implementation, K-2nd Reading Mastery Special Edition (RMSE), and 3rd-5th Corrective Reading for our students to assist with reading deficiencies.

Also, all Reading teachers will participate in a book study to expose teachers to reading best practices. In addition, our teachers will work with our Reading Coach with the book study as well as in weekly professional development to plan out standards based instructions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Direct instruction; Small group

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are using DI programs such as Reading Mastery Signature Edition and Corrective Reading because they are proven to help students master essential decoding and comprehension skills. The lessons encompass multiple strands; phonemic awareness, letter-sound correspondence, sounding out words, vocabulary, oral reading fluency, and comprehension.
Hence, we use a small group model for planning: To promote teaching reading to reading instructors. To ensure that content and assessments are aligned to standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Support from the Reading Coach/Interventionist to plan instruction and break down standards.
2. Support for teachers with planning and implementing new strategies (Learning Arc/PLC vs. CP)
3. Students will be pulled for small group instruction
4. Frequent data chats with teachers and students.
5. Utilize weekly Walk-throughs to calibrate SBI school-wide expectations

Person Responsible Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During the 2018-2019 school year Math proficiency experienced a 7% decrease dropping to 43%. This is twenty percentage points short of the state average (63%) and 19 percentage points short of the district average (62%). Teachers must have additional support to provide rigorous, grade level standards based instruction for students. This instruction must also be differentiated based on the individual needs of students.

Our school will focus on standards-based grade-level instruction and differentiated this instruction based on the individual needs of students; student achievement will increase.

Measurable Outcome: The intended outcome is for all students to receive standards-based instruction daily via the whole group as well as in a small group to decrease math deficiencies. To accomplish this goal, we will host ongoing professional development, explicitly teaching teachers and support staff on how to unpack standards to ensure lesson activities are aligned with state standard requirements for students to demonstrate standard mastery. In addition to PD, additional supplemental materials and programs implemented, 2nd - 5th Acaletics and I-Ready for our students to assist with math deficiencies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Regina Rowan-Thomas (rowan-thor@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Direct instruction; Small group

We know that students who are lower performing need more direct instruction. With periodic data chats, students will know what areas to focus on for their individual growth. By participating in weekly Professional Development (PD), our K-5 teachers will have assistance with identifying deficiencies and planning instruction to meet the needs of all learners better.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In addition, our school will host Parent Family Nights to work with parents in the area of math. We will provide the necessary supplies for parents to complete these activities. In addition, we will allow our parents to utilize our parent resource room to check out any math materials that they can use to aid their child at home. Our parent liaison will work with parents whenever needed to promote the use of parent resource room as well as with any other parent academy classes utilized to support them with aiding their child at home.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Support from the Assistant Principal to plan instruction and break down standards.
2. Support for teachers with planning and implementing new strategies
3. Students will be pulled for small group instruction by the math interventionists.
4. Frequent data chats with teachers and students.

Person Responsible Regina Rowan-Thomas (rowan-thor@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Through reviewing the data as well as individual/group conferences with teachers, parents, and students, we were able to identify as a Leadership Team that we have students that have difficulty with peer mediation, specifically low self-esteem, and conflict resolution

Our goal is for our students to better understand how peer mediation can lead to positive interactions with peers as well as faculty and staff.

Measurable Outcome: Initial steps have been made to identify teachers that would like to serve as part of the Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) Team on our campus. In addition, we will have the support of our district Behavioral Support Staff to ensure we follow best practices in establishing our school-wide PBIS protocols for students and teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Regina Rowan-Thomas (rowan-thor@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Calm Classroom
 Sanford Harmony

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By implementing PBIS System in our school, our students will have an opportunity to practice what Positive Behavior looks like in the classroom and throughout our school. Students will also practice the PBIS strategies daily in all common areas as well as in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) We will implement a "Calm Classroom" technique in our classroom,
- 2) Our guidance counselor will teach Sanford Harmony Lessons to our students.

Person Responsible Regina Rowan-Thomas (rowan-thor@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus - Improve standards-based planning process (including creation of learning arcs with aligned tasks and assessments) and execution of those plans in content areas specific to Language Arts, Math and Science (5th Grade initially then expand across all grade levels).

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Description and Rationale - The 2019-2020 school year marked a beginning point for genuine standards-based instruction, tasks, and assessments alignment at Stonewall Jackson Elementary. Due to COVID-19, our school year was greatly impacted when we moved to full-time virtual learning that was vastly asynchronous in nature and our previously successful professional community work shifted to a focus on navigating the virtual platforms and the focus on engaging as many students in that platform as possible, causing at least a quarter's worth of professional learning time previously dedicated to standards-based instruction to be lost. The data from the instructional walk-throughs prior to the shift to virtual instruction indicated that the administrative team was calibrated in most instances and that the standards were the key focus of the planning process including the design of student tasks and assessments in all state accountability areas. Due to COVID-19 and the instructional collaboration time that was lost, we as a school feel there is a need to re-calibrate before progressing forward in the standards-based instructional continuum. We also have new teachers on our campus in accountability grade levels that will require additional professional development to be brought up to speed with our planning processes and task and assessment design to allow us to progress forward in the standards-based instructional continuum.

Measurable Outcome:

95% of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction planning processes including the creation of learning arcs for each standard with aligned tasks and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Provide effective standards-based instruction in all core content areas including the design of formative and summative assessments, instructional delivery, and student learning aligned tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

TNTP's published study "The Opportunity Myth" which addresses the need for "consistent opportunities [for students] to work on grade-appropriate assignments" and for "teachers who hold high expectations for students and truly believe they can meet grade-level standards."

Action Steps to Implement

Principal will participate in training on the relationship between the School Improvement Plan and the Standards-Based Initiative requirements and turnkey information to the entire Leadership Team which consists of the Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math and Reading Interventionist.

Person Responsible

Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)

Principal will participate in School Improvement Rounds with school cluster for continued professional learning with the Standards-Based Initiative and in preparation for Standards-Based Instructional Reviews.

Person Responsible

Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)

Provide on-going support specific to Language Arts, Math and Science (5th) teachers through PLC work focused on conversation around standards including the creation of aligned tasks, materials and student assessments and the reflection of student work and performance on formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

Our school allows parents to be involved in parent involvement planning. Also, our school hosts parent academy classes. We host several family nights with our parents. Our SAC also is aware of and involved in the activities that we host. Students are also involved in the Positive Behavior Monthly activities that we use to celebrate students for following our PBIS System. In addition, we host monthly math activities for our students to be a part of as a way to recognize their math abilities. We have other activities such as administration lunch bunch activities. In addition, students follow daily rituals and routines that are set by our PBIS Team. We have students participate in our morning news crew as well as cafeteria helpers. Students have in the classroom to be innovative. Besides the school-wide positive incentive, teachers have their own established reward systems. We ensure that our parents are always aware of our school plan through phone messaging, class/school dojo, parent newsletters, the marquee, and other communication mediums.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00