

Duval County Public Schools

Gregory Drive Elementary School



2019-20 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
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Gregory Drive Elementary School

7800 GREGORY DR, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

Demographics

Principal: Augena Sapp

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (35%) 2014-15: D (38%)
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 was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Gregory Drive Elementary School

7800 GREGORY DR, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	D	D	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Gregory Drive Elementary School is a school in which every child, regardless of his or her background, becomes a healthy, productive, and educated member of society, through a safe and supportive academic experience.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will become a successful reader by integrating math, science, and technology across all academic areas to reach his or her highest potential, drawing on the child's entire community for support.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sapp, Augena	Principal	AuGena Sapp, Principal - Will monitor standards taught and planned for core curriculum. Monitor and model the use of Gradual Release Model, and scaffolded instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Student data will be monitored and analyzed through data chats and monitored during monthly RTI meetings. Instruction will be monitored through classroom observations(Perform) and frequent forms of feedback. Professional development will be determined based on all of the above. As needed, the principal will initiate growth plans for intensive professional development and monitor task completion.
Washington, Teri	Instructional Coach	Teri Washington, Math Coach - Provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and implementation of rigorous math instruction as it pertains to Common Core standards/ New Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and requested and assists teachers with lesson planning. She also supports teachers by conducting intervention on a small group of students.
Brown, Tangela	School Counselor	Tangela Brown, School Counselor- Facilitates MRT meetings, Problem Solving/RTI meetings, 504 meetings. Serves as the school's liaison between the school and the district as it pertains to MRT (Multi-Referral Team) meetings on a monthly basis. Supports the needs of the whole child and provides resources to parents.
Clawson, Tamme	Administrative Support	Tamme Clawson - Reading Interventionist - Provides instructional support and intervention for students in the area of ELA. Analyzes data and plans next steps for instruction to move students towards being on grade level.
Mincey, Mornike	Assistant Principal	Mornike Mincey, Assistant Principal - Will monitor standards taught and planned for core curriculum. Monitor and model the use of Gradual Release Model, and scaffolded instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Student data will be monitored and analyzed through data chats and monitored during monthly RTI meetings. Instruction will be monitored through classroom observations(Perform) and frequent forms of feedback. Professional development will be determined based on all of the above.

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	99	112	91	99	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	46	35	36	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	
One or more suspensions	0	2	11	10	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	73	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	

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	35	67	55	71	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320	

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	8	7	9	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide 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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	38	46	35	36	38	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223
One or more suspensions	20	11	10	18	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	20	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	1	0	73	73	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222

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	22	75	41	73	65	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	343

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	30%	50%	57%	23%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	56%	58%	44%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	53%	62%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	39%	62%	63%	29%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	63%	62%	41%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	51%	34%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	21%	48%	53%	28%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	99 (0)	112 (0)	91 (0)	99 (0)	104 (0)	505 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	38 (0)	46 (0)	35 (0)	36 (0)	38 (0)	193 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (0)	11 (0)	10 (0)	18 (0)	19 (0)	60 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	73 (0)	73 (0)	146 (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.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%
	2018	30%	50%	-20%	57%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	29%	52%	-23%	58%	-29%
	2018	23%	49%	-26%	56%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	30%	50%	-20%	56%	-26%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	61%	-30%	62%	-31%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	64%	-17%	64%	-17%
	2018	23%	60%	-37%	62%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	33%	57%	-24%	60%	-27%
	2018	34%	61%	-27%	61%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	20%	49%	-29%	53%	-33%
	2018	36%	56%	-20%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	18	17		11	38						

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
ELL	14	73		21	82						
BLK	28	43	39	37	58	60	19				
HSP	20	71	80	40	84		20				
MUL	58			67							
WHT	33	48		35	48		15				
FRL	27	45	52	36	57	63	16				
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	23	21		36	23		20				
ELL	11	21		22	29						
ASN	55			64							
BLK	24	40	33	29	38	33	28				
HSP	30	27		41	43		20				
MUL	50			63							
WHT	43	54		35	48		61				
FRL	29	42	33	34	41	33	35				
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	25	57		36	46		18				
ELL	5	40		19	45						
ASN	46	73		54	36						
BLK	23	45	62	26	42	32	28				
HSP	12	35		29	48		30				
MUL	15			31							
WHT	33	39		34	41		33				
FRL	23	43	57	26	41	38	23				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement. The proficiency was 21%. The contributing factors was the fact that the entire 5th grade science team was novice. There was also very little common planning devoted to the science subject area. Generally our science data aligns with our ELA data, however, this was not the case this year.

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

Science was the data component that showed the greatest decline from last year's data. Last year, there was an extreme push of science and there was instructional time allotted for ELA and Math/ Science teachers to use the last hour of the day to teach science. This was not possible this year because of our increased focus on ELA and Math intervention implementations.

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 showed the greatest gap with a 32 point margin between us. We scored 21% compared to the states 53%. The contributing factors have been mentioned above.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our Math Lowest 25th Percentile with an improvement of 30%. The implementation of the program Acaletics in Math provided our students with rigorous practice daily to increase their math performance.

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

The major area of concern is student attendance.

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

1. Student attendance
2. Science Proficiency
3. ELA Proficiency
4. ELA Gains
5. Math Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	<p>Improving English/Language Arts Instruction</p> <p>~ 30% of the students were proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment for ELA</p> <p>~ 53% of K-5 students scored On or Above Level on the i-Ready Reading Spring Diagnostic</p> <p>~ Reading gains on the FSA 49% in 2019 from 42% in 2018.</p> <p>~ Reading bottom quartile gains on the FSA from 33% to 53%</p> <p>~ There is a need for continued development in the area of standard/content knowledge by the classroom teachers</p>
Rationale	<p>~ Duval Reads curriculum has been replaced and the focus was on teaching the standards by using various resources that were supported by the Common Core standards and achievement level descriptors. This implementation was a work in progress for the year.</p> <p>~ Teachers need to be knowledgeable of standards, item specifications, and question stems as they are planning instruction and be able to analyze student work for alignment.</p> <p>~ Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery Signature Edition is a powerful Direct Instruction remedial reading series that solves a wide range of problems for struggling older readers, even if they have failed with other approaches. This will be used as a supplement with the intention of improving student performance in reading.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>~ Increase ELA Proficiency to 41%</p> <p>~ Increase ELA Gains to 56%</p> <p>~ Increase BQ ELA Gains to 60%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilization and monitoring of Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery Signature Edition, Leveled Literacy Intervention, and Language for Learning. 2. Standards Walk-through observations to monitor the instructional delivery of the standards and objectives will build capacity within the teachers. 3. Common planning structured to unpack the standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correcting the gap in literacy is the objective in order to build proficiency in reading. These researched based programs correct the foundational deficiencies and builds fluency for improved comprehension. 2. Monitoring instructional delivery and standards based alignment with feedback will provide teachers with immediate strategies for implementation in order to improve student academic achievement. 3. Research indicates that fully teaching the standards will produce better results.
Action Step	
Description	<p>~Teachers will engage in weekly Common Planning to unpack, plan, and pull resources focused on standards based instruction.</p> <p>~ Provide Professional Learning Cycles to plan standards based units of study using authentic literature and analyzing student work for alignment.</p> <p>~ Provide the students with more texts in hand for increased exposure to literature.</p> <p>~ Increased remediation with the Bottom Quartile students using Leveled Literacy Instruction, Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery Signature Edition, Language for Learning, and Benchmark Assessments.</p>

~Engagement in real world experiences to build student background knowledge by planning field trip to support standards.
 ~Frequent walk-through observations with feedback from administration and instructional support staff.

Person Responsible Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

#2

Title Improving Science Instruction

Rationale Science Achievement for 2019 decreased from 38% to 21%. Our goal was 45% for this school year and we fell short of that goal.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve 2019-2020 Science Achievement goal is 31%. Students will be targeted for proficiency and their data will be monitored to solidify their proficiency by providing remediation for the standards that do not meet mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

1. Acaletics Science is a standards based program that provides daily exposure to standards to build fluent knowledge of content and vocabulary in the area of Science.
2. Common planning structured to unpack the standards
3. Standards Walk-through observations to monitor the instructional delivery of the standards and objectives will build capacity within the teachers
4. Implementation of Study Island for increased science instruction through computer based engaging explorations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

1. Data supports that the use of this program with fidelity would increase student performance in double digit percentages.
2. Research indicates that fully teaching the standards will produce better results.
3. Monitoring instructional delivery and standards based alignment with feedback will provide teachers with immediate strategies for implementation in order to improve student academic achievement.

Action Step

Description

- ~ Provide teachers with Science Professional Learning Cycles once per month to plan standards based units of study using exploration and literature with a focus on analyzing student work for alignment.
- ~ Provide the students with more literature integration in Science.
- ~ Providing students with monthly benchmark assessments in order to monitor mastery of standards taught.
- ~ Increased remediation of standards by analyzing assessment data monthly
- ~ Engagement in real world experiences to build student background knowledge by planning field trips to support standards.
- ~ Monitoring fidelity of use for Acaletics Science
- ~ Frequent walk-through observations with feedback from administration and instructional support staff.

Person Responsible Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Improving Math Instruction
Rationale	Although math achievement increased this year from 34% to 39%, it is still reflecting that less than 50% of our students are performing on level in mathematics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Increase Math Proficiency to 49% ~ Increase Math Gains to 67% ~ Increase BQ ELA Gains to 70%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acaletics Math is a standards based program that provides daily exposure to standards to build fluent knowledge of content and strategies in the area of Math. 2. Common planning structured to unpack the standards 3. Standards Walk-through observations to monitor the instructional delivery of the standards and objectives will build capacity within the teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data supports that the use of Acaletics Math with fidelity would increase student performance in double digit percentages. 2. Research indicates that fully teaching the standards will produce better results. 3. Monitoring instructional delivery and standards based alignment with feedback will provide teachers with immediate strategies for implementation in order to improve student academic achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~Provide teachers weekly common planning sessions to plan by unpacking the standards and aligning resources, manipulatives, and strategies for math to build effective lessons. ~ Provide teachers with Math Professional Learning Cycles to analyzing student work and assessments. ~ Provide the students with more fact fluency practice. ~Providing students with frequent assessments in order to monitor mastery of standards taught. ~ Increased remediation of standards by analyzing assessment data monthly ~Engagement in real world experiences to build student background knowledge by planning field trips to support standards. ~Monitoring fidelity of use for Acaletics Math ~Frequent walk-through observations with feedback from administration and instructional support staff.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4

Title Improved Whole Child Development (Attendance and Behavior)

Rationale ~Our early warning systems indicate that we have a massive number of students with attendance below 90%. There were 38 first graders, 46 second graders, 35 third graders, 36 fourth graders, and 38 fifth graders who had poor attendance. Their attendance in school would provide ample time that we need in order to improve their academic achievement, as well as their social and emotional improvement.
~There were 60 students with one or more suspensions and the majority of them were in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

1. Decrease the EWS Attendance below 90% from 193 students to 90 students or less.
2. Decrease out of school suspension from 60 students to 20 students or less.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tangela Brown (buttst1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

1. Improve attendance by hiring a staff member who would monitor tardies and attendance each morning. This personnel would make phone calls daily to notify parents of the absence and encourage them to immediately report to school. This staff member would also support positive behavior through motivation and incentives.
2. Monthly parties will be awarded to grade levels that have the least amount of students absent. This would be reported by the attendance monitor.
3. Conduct restorative practices and instructional in school suspension.
4. Implement Calm Classrooms for increased mindfulness to help students control their thoughts and behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

~The monitoring and celebration of attendance would increase our academic performance because students will be present and ready for instruction.
~The implementation of restorative practices and ISSP would also keep students within the school to positively impact their behavioral management.

Action Step

Description

1. School-wide Beginning of the Year Assembly to establish expectations for attendance and behavior
2. Consistent restorative practice and issuance of consequences that nurture rather than suspend.
3. Positive celebrations for great/improved behavior and attendance.
4. Implementation of Calm Classrooms for student mindfulness

Person Responsible

Tangela Brown (buttst1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Please see Parental Involvement Plan.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The school ensures that the social-emotional needs of the students are being met by ensuring that classrooms are a place in which children feel safe and accepted. The school counselor plays an active role in communicating to teachers the needs of all students. If children have additional needs, they are referred to the guidance counselor. If a student is marked absent an automated phone call to placed to the parent/guardian. We also have a full time therapist available for families to be serviced here on the school's campus.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

During pre-planning an orientation is held for students and parents to acclimate them to Gregory Drive Elementary and communicate school expectations.

Parent nights to acclimate parents to rituals and routines for kindergarten - 5th grade students and the assessments students will take to obtain student achievement levels.

3rd, 4th, and 5th grade departmentalized classes to help with easy transition into middle school for 5th graders with more focused core instruction.

5th graders will tour neighborhood middle schools during last quarter to prepare for transition and expectations of middle school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Title I funds are used to purchase additional academic support positions: Reading Interventionist, Math Interventionist, full time Media, additional full time paraprofessional, and tutors for after school tutoring. Funds are also used to support academic improvement through purchasing i-Ready MAFS instructional materials as well as Study Island for Science. Additional funds will be used to purchase and to provide

professional development for teachers on best practices and effective instructional strategies, instructional materials, and instructional programs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

- College week will be implemented school wide in May.
- Career fair will be implemented by leadership team and school counselor
- STEM night
- Faculty and staff represent their college on Fridays and with shirts and pennants displayed outside of their room.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving English/Language Arts Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving Science Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving Math Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improved Whole Child Development (Attendance and Behavior)	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00