Greenfield Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Greenfield Elementary School

6343 KNIGHTS LN N, Jacksonville, FL 32216

http://www.duvalschools.org/greenfield

Demographics

Principal: Cindy Gentry

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
2020-21 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

> * 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

Greenfield Elementary School

6343 KNIGHTS LN N, Jacksonville, FL 32216

http://www.duvalschools.org/greenfield

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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.

Greenfield's Mission is to create a positive and secure environment for learning in a changing community where staff and students strive to meet their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenfield's Vision: A Community working together to meet the needs of ALL students.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Suzannah	Reading Coach	Provides support for teachers through coaching and professional learning.
Vincent, Lisa	Other	Provides Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions for struggling readers.
Schmidt, Chrissy	Instructional Coach	Provides support for ESE/CSS teachers through coaching and professional learning.
McGee, Bridget	Assistant Principal	Supports/assists the principal with the recruitment, retention, evaluation, and development of instructional and school staff. Assists with the monitoring and evaluation of the instructional program and the establishment of instructional targets. Helps monitor progress towards goals and ensures a positive, safe school environment for students, faculty, and staff. Engages parents and community members in the instructional program.
Gentry, Cindy	Principal	Leads the work of recruiting, retaining, evaluating, and developing instructional and school staff. Monitors and evaluates the instructional program. Establishes instructional targets and monitors progress towards goals. Ensures a positive, safe school environment for students, faculty, and staff. Engages parents and community members in the instructional program.
Smith, Leezola	Math Coach	Provides support for teachers through coaching and professional learning.
Baker, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Provides support for teachers through coaching and professional learning.
McKinney, Jennifer	School Counselor	Supports the emotional and mental well-being of students through classroom guidance and small/counseling; leads the work of the Multi-disciplinary Referral Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Cindy Gentry

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.*
5

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

550

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

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

13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	88	112	83	95	69	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	0	41	26	20	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	7	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	31	51	42	33	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	48	41	44	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	44	42	38	31	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	6	4	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/29/2021

2020-21 - 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	94	103	84	96	101	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	20	15	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	2	1	5	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	7	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	45	58	60	48	41	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	56	81	60	57	40	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325

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	47	59	56	46	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272

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	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

2020-21 - 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	94	103	84	96	101	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	20	15	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	2	1	5	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	7	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	45	58	60	48	41	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	56	81	60	57	40	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325

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	47	59	56	46	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272

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	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				50%	50%	57%	52%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	56%	58%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	50%	53%	51%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	62%	63%	64%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	63%	62%	61%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	52%	51%	33%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	48%	53%	70%	55%	55%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	50%	-5%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

K: I-Ready Reading and Math
1: I-Ready Reading and Math
2: I-Ready Reading and Math
3: Progress Monitoring Assessments for ELA and Math
4: Progress Monitoring Assessments for ELA and Math
5: Progress Monitoring Assessments for ELA, Math, and Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/16%	17/24%	24/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14%	10/24%	13/33%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	2/18%	5/42%
	English Language Learners	1/4%	0/0%	2/8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/6%	10/14%	35/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/6%	5/12%	20/50%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	1/(5	6/50%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	2/9%	6/25%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/24%	42/52%	46/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/23%	28/57%	29/63%
	Students With Disabilities	3/17%	3/33%	4/36%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/5%	2/10%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/10%	28/35%	40/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/11%	17/35%	26/57%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	2/25%	3/27%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	1/5%	5/25%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/26%	18/25%	28/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/20%	9/22%	14/30%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	1/17%	1/17%
	English Language Learners	5/16%	4/13%	8/24%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/41%	39/53%	39/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/40%	21/50%	21/45%
	Students With Disabilities	2/40%	5/83%	4/67%
	English Language Learners	6/19%	12/38%	13/38%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26/35%	35/46%	32/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/42%	22/51%	19/42%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%	5/38%	4/31%
	English Language Learners	3/13%	4/15%	3/11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28/35%	31/40%	38/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/36%	18/41%	21/48%
	Students With Disabilities	4/31%	4/31%	6/50%
	English Language Learners	2/8%	5/19%	5/18%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/27%	30/36%	40/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/22%	16/34%	25/52%
	Students With Disabilities	2/20%	2/17%	4/36%
	English Language Learners	2/8%	1/5%	1/5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/22%	16/19%	20/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/21%	7/16%	10/21%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	3/25%	2/18%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/5%	0/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/15%	23/27%	23/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/13%	11/24%	14/29%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/17%	1/9%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/10%	0/0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	36	53		45	47		21				
ELL	38	72	64	51	48		21				
ASN	72	82		72	73		36				
BLK	46	47		50	24		17				
HSP	32	74	70	52	54	30	13				
MUL	29			47							
WHT	65	81		60	44		43				
FRL	42	65	62	50	41	27	26				

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	41	41	41	54	47	19				
ELL	35	59	55	54	60	41	32				
ASN	67	65		83	80						
BLK	44	65		57	76	70	36				
HSP	36	59	57	57	65	39	23				
MUL	68	69		63	46						
WHT	57	70		70	63		61				
FRL	46	69	72	61	70	52	49				

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	25	43	44	30	39	32	33				
ELL	38	58	57	60	59	42	77				
ASN	73	79		82	79		90				
BLK	43	59		49	50		53				
HSP	43	43	32	65	58	35	75				
MUL	67			58							
WHT	55	55		68	61	38	74				
FRL	53	58	59	63	58	31	69				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	63
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

English Language Learners were the lowest performing subgroup across grade levels and content areas. Fifth grade math and science performance seemed to decline from previous years. First, third, and fourth grade ELA proficiency levels were below 40%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the most recent state assessment data, the areas in greatest need of improvement are Science, ELA Achievement, and Math Lowest Performing Quartile.

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

The factors that contributed to this need for improvement include novice teachers in fifth grade math and science, poor student attendance (and other pandemic-related factors). To address this need for improvement, teachers will need to acquire research-proven instructional strategies for English Language Learners and students with disabilities. Also, research-based interventions are needed for students in need.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

When comparing the 2028 to 2019 state assessment results, the data component that showed the most improvement was the lowest quartile gains (+18). When comparing fall to spring progress monitoring data, the area with the most improvement was fifth grade ELA achievement with an increase of 21 percentage points.

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

The increase in learning gains for the lowest quartile can be attributed to the use of targeted interventions, such as small group instruction.

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

Small group, differentiated instruction will be needed to accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development in analyzing student work, grouping students based on formative assessment, and the use of targeted interventions will be provided in order to support teachers.

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

The use of ongoing progress monitoring with just in time interventions for students will be needed to sustain improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Maintain and Increase Student Achievement in ELA. Students in grades 3 through 5 are performing below proficiency levels.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, 3rd-5th grade students will increase by 10 percentage points (from 47% to 57%) in ELA as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	District Progress Monitoring Assessments will be used to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize Performance Matters - District and School's Standards-Based Assessments Utilize the Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist Implement Small Group Instruction and Tutoring Provide Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for Grades 3-5 Provide student access to Renaissance Learning (Freckle) and Achieve 3000 using dedicated laptops for students in the Lowest Performing Quartile Provide Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE) Grades K-2 Implement Freckle Math and Achieve 3000 with fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. A Reading Coach position will be used to design, monitor, and assess reading achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers. 2. A Reading Interventionist position will be used to support student learning in small groups to improve reading and writing skills. 3. Materials will be purchased to support the lowest performing students in small group instruction. Materials include but are not limited to LLI kits, laptop computers (20), online subscriptions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The reading coach will train teachers on how to use the Item Specs and the ALDs to ensure lessons, tasks/activities, and assessments are aligned to standards.
2. Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs and common planning sessions, led by the reading coach, to ensure a deep understanding of the depth of the standards, to plan standards-aligned lessons and assessments, and to review student work to monitor progress and plan appropriate interventions for students who are not making adequate progress.
3. The reading interventionist will provide Tier 2/3 interventions using LLI for students who have not yet reached proficiency.
4. The reading coach will assist teachers in planning for small group instruction for students who have not reached proficiency.
5. Classroom teachers will provide small group instruction using a variety of intervention resources.

Person Responsible	Suzannah Williams (williamss24@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to accelerate learning for all student sub-groups, teachers must provide standards-aligned instruction and use standards-aligned materials and assessments in the classroom.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, 100% of the teachers will provide standards-aligned instruction as evidenced by scores of 4, 3, and 3 for Standards Focus Board, Instructional Delivery, and Assessment as measured by the Standards Walkthrough Tool.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored using the district standards walkthrough tool during weekly classroom observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented is instruction that is aligned to grade level standards, instructional deliver using the gradual release of responsibility model, and on-going progress monitoring using standards-aligned assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to accelerate achievement, students must work on grade level work.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide in-depth professional learning for new teachers and a refresher for experienced teachers on the expectations for standards-aligned instruction including the use of the focus board, strategies for instructional delivery, and standards-aligned assessments.
2. Instructional coaches will provide model lessons for classroom teachers.
3. Instructional coaches will support teachers through PLCs to ensure deep understanding of standards.
4. Instructional coaches will support teachers through common planning to ensure tasks and assessments are aligned to standards.
5. Teachers will participate in instructional rounds to observe their colleagues provide standards-aligned lessons.

Person Responsible	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the most recent state assessment data, students with disabilities are performing less well than their peers without learning disabilities in ELA, Math and Science
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, students with disabilities will increase proficiency by 10 percentage points on the FSA in reading, math, and science (5th grade only).
Monitoring:	Student performance will be monitored using the district Progress Monitoring Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom teachers, the reading interventionists, and instructional coaches will provide small group interventions three times or more per week in reading, math, and science for students with disabilities who are not yet proficient.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	More targeted support will ensure students are making adequate progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional coaches (reading and math) will guide teachers through an analysis of data to determine which students are in need of additional support.
2. Instructional coaches will guide teachers through the forming of instructional groups and areas of focus for students with disabilities.
3. Instructional coaches will assist teachers in the planning of instruction to be delivered in the small group setting for students with disabilities in reading, math, and science.
4. Instructional coaches will review student work and other sources of data with teachers each week to measure student growth and plan next steps for small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Leezola Smith (coatesl@duvalschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the most recent data from the Five Essentials Survey, teachers report that collaborative practices, such as looking at assessment data together, planning for instruction, and observing colleagues rarely or never occurred. .
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year, the Collaborative Practices section of the Five Essentials Survey will increase by 25 percentage points or more.
Monitoring:	-periodic surveys will be administered throughout the year to measure changes. -Common Planning agendas and minutes
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Teachers will help develop the common planning agenda along with the leadership team. 2. Teachers will engage in looking at student work and data using structured protocols. 3. Teachers will engage in instructional walks with a focus on standards-based instruction, debrief their findings and provide feedback for colleagues.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative practices will increase and improve with increased opportunities for collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a electronic survey for teachers to complete monthly to have input in common planning agendas.
2. Implement Strategies with fidelity (common planning, student work analysis, instructional walks) .
3. Monitor PLCs and Common Planning for effectiveness.

Person Responsible	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Out of school suspensions will be monitored closely and the school will reduce out of school suspensions by half. School culture and discipline will be monitored monthly by reviewing behavior incidents and consequences and through data collected by the PBIS team through the observation of common areas around the school.

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.

Greenfield Elementary School will build a strong school culture by increasing teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-support staff, teacher-to-administration, faculty-to-parent, and parent engagement within the school. Administration, teachers, and parents will collaborate to establish targeted and meaningful family workshops to support and empower student academics and social success. Parents will have an opportunity to volunteer at the school and attend decision-making meetings focused on overall school improvement.

Greenfield's activities/events to increase faculty and family engagement include:

1. Implement team building activities to develop a cohesive and collaborative culture
2. Provide teachers an opportunity to complete a survey or needs assessment so that I can better understand where they need assistance
3. Nightly Parent Events to build relationships and empower parents to work with their students
4. ELL Parental Workshops
5. SAC
6. PTA
7. Stakeholders Meetings
Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

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

Administrators will ensure that teachers are trained on the Positive Behavior and Intervention Plan for the school and strategies for promoting a positive classroom environment and school.
Teachers and staff will use common area lesson plans to teach students expectations for common areas including the cafeteria, hallways, group restrooms, and the playground. Teachers will also teach schoolwide expectations and guidelines for success. Calm classroom and Sanford Harmony will be used to promote a positive classroom environment.
Students will follow guidelines for success and meet school wide expectations at all times.
Support staff will use active supervision and positive redirection techniques to ensure students understand and follow expectations.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$12,180.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	2221 - Greenfield Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$12,180.00
			Notes: $12,180 has been allotted in the Title I Budget for the purchase of 20 laptop computers.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning				$0.00
					Total:	$12,180.00