

Duval County Public Schools

# New Berlin Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# New Berlin Elementary School

3613 NEW BERLIN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Raquel Foxworth**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: A (67%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# New Berlin Elementary School

3613 NEW BERLIN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	38%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	A	B

## 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.**

New Berlin is committed to Excellence and Learning for All.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To empower each learner to reach their highest potential.

### 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
------	-------	---------------------------------

Additional school leaders (were not available to select from drop-down):

- Ashley Moore, Assistant Principal (starsa@duvalschools.org)
- Armerdra Merksion, Assistant Principal (merkisona@duvalschools.org)
- Brenda Cornish, Guidance Counselor (cornishb@duvalschools.org)
- Jesse Shugart, Guidance Counselor
- Katie Burns, Kindergarten Teacher
- Aimee Warren, 1st Grade Teacher
- Marcia Medders, 2nd Grade Teacher
- Sarah Milenchick, 3rd Grade Teacher
- Erin Simonton, 4th Grade Teacher
- Laurel Cox, 5th Grade Teacher
- Brenda Elliott, VE Teacher
- Raney Manning, Art Teacher

Principal and Assistant Principal Job Duties and Responsibilities:

- Lead the MTSS team and Leadership team in bi-weekly meeting focus on implementing the school vision and mission
- Disseminates information in a timely manner
- Monitors and supports and use of data-based decisionmaking
- Ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rt
- Conducts frequent assessments of Rtl skills of the school staff
- Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation
- Ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation
- Communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.

Lewis,  
Crystal

Principal

Guidance Counselors Job Duties and Responsibilities:

- Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students
- Organizes MRT meetings
- Works with teachers to provide support for the students' academic, emotional, behavioral and social success
- Provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators -
- Provides group and individual student interventions
- Conducts direct observation of student behavior
- Conducts Child Safety Matters lessons in classrooms
- Support implementation of Sanford Harmony curriculum

Teacher Job Duties and Responsibilities:

- Attend summer and weekly leadership team meetings
  - Develop a sense of teamwork that contributes to high morale
  - Take the initiative to understand the "big picture" of making a school work and support the mission/vision of the school
  - Review faculty handbook
  - Conduct weekly team meetings
- Ensure information is forwarded in a timely manner and report grade-level response/ consensus as needed
- Verify grade level representation for all committees and emphasize the importance of participation



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

- Assign responsibilities for field trips
- Assign responsibilities for weekly/monthly parent letter to send via DoJo
- Assign responsibilities for monthly minutes and ensure all are posted online
- Ensure protocol is followed when addressing concerns
- Read all communication in a timely manner in order to serve as a team resource.

### 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	193	211	190	184	206	227	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1211
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	2	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators		0	2	0	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

**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		10	10	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

61

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/30/2019

#### Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**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	24	18	27	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	21	20	10	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	11	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

**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	26	24	29	25	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

**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	73%	50%	57%	68%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	50%	53%	55%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	62%	63%	85%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	63%	62%	77%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	51%	76%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	48%	53%	74%	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	193 (0)	211 (0)	190 (0)	184 (0)	206 (0)	227 (0)	1211 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	2 ( )	2 ( )	6 ( )	11 ( )	21 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	4 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	12 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 ( )	7 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	19 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	10 (0)	19 (0)	32 (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	76%	51%	25%	58%	18%
	2018	81%	50%	31%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	52%	18%	58%	12%
	2018	73%	49%	24%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	66%	50%	16%	56%	10%
	2018	66%	51%	15%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	64%	23%	64%	23%
	2018	86%	60%	26%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	72%	57%	15%	60%	12%
	2018	84%	61%	23%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	49%	24%	53%	20%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	43	42	45	59	50	47	45				
ASN	85	87		100	93						
BLK	67	61	67	77	65	55	66				
HSP	76	63		84	72		73				
MUL	68	54		77	69						
WHT	75	58	54	86	70	68	78				
FRL	66	58	60	78	68	63	70				
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	52	54	60	65	73	75	38				
ASN	81			86							
BLK	75	62	48	86	82	82	70				
HSP	80	61		84	68		80				
MUL	65	53		73	71						
WHT	72	61	49	88	74	70	83				
FRL	68	59	55	82	78	75	76				
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	40	39	33	49	53	54	55				
ASN	69	40		79	73						
BLK	67	69	75	86	78	78	70				
HSP	73	62		86	76						
MUL	47	33		77	80						
WHT	70	61	50	85	77	73	79				
FRL	59	58	52	76	77	74	68				

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

**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	91
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	65
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	74
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	67
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	70
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	66
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 SWD subgroup for ELA Achievement (43%) and ELA Learning Gains (42%) was the lowest-performing. This is a trend as both school grade components for this subgroup are significantly lower than the school average from the previous year as well(2018 SWD ELA Achievement 52% and ELA Learning Gains 54%). Contributing factors include consistent structure and support by VE teachers across all grade levels, as well as, the use of instructional materials that align to grade-level standards used with fidelity by all teachers that support this subgroup.

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

Math BQ Learning Gains for the Students with Disabilities subgroup showed the greatest decline. For one particular grade level, the ESE teacher was new to the content area and not familiar with grade-level standards. Additionally, scheduling and support in a three-way split provided to be a contributing factor to the decline.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Our greatest gap, when compared to the state average, is in the school grade component of Science Achievement. The school had 74% of students scoring proficient in science while the state average was only 53%. 5th-grade science teachers disaggregate data weekly during common planning based on interim and progress monitoring assessments. Formative data is gathered frequently and compared to the Achievement Level Descriptors to evaluate how students are performing on the standards. Teachers use this data to drive instruction.

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

ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains had the most improvement. Last year ELA teacher began to utilize the Ready LAFS curriculum for core instruction. This curriculum supported our lowest-performing students by providing explicit instruction on grade-level standards. This growth was evident in all subgroups except Students with Disabilities. 3rd-5th grade teachers structured their ELA block to differentiate instruction and utilize gradual release with Ready LAFS lessons to pull small groups of students during work time. This provided a lower teacher to student ratio and more opportunities to remediate deficiencies with our lowest-performing student.

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

When reviewing the Early Warning Indicators it is evident that we have a higher percentage of 5th graders that score a Level 1 in ELA or Math. This is a trend each year and the number of students scoring level 1 increases from 3rd to 5th. This indicates that we are unable to sustain students learning gains from year to year and thus ensure all students make annual growth.

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

1. Increase Math learning gains in BQ students with disabilities
2. Increase ELA Achievement for students with disabilities
3. Increase ELA learning gains for students with disabilities
4. Decrease percentage of students who score Level 1 in Math and ELA
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Academics
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>-Decrease in all Math school grade components last year.</p> <p>-Greatest decline in Math BQ Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities.</p> <p>-Lowest performance in ELA achievement and Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities.</p> <p>-A decline in ELA BQ Learning Gains and Overall Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities from 17-18 school year to 18-19 school year.</p> <p>Current data shows many students regress in their achievement levels and are not demonstrating annual growth.</p>

<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	If we focus data-driven instruction and differentiate rigorous content aligned to the standard, at least 75% or more will achieve at least one year's growth in Math and ELA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Restructure common planning time to focus on data analysis, unpacking standards and aligning learning activities.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of understanding the depth of standards</li> <li>- Insufficient use of Item Specifications</li> <li>- Insufficient use of Achievement Level Descriptors</li> <li>- Lack of understanding/use of data to drive centers and small group instruction</li> </ul>

<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Through teacher and administrator collaboration, common planning sessions will focus on analyzing current data and identifying needed targets for students eligible for learning gains and bottom quartile gains.</li> <li>2. Guided by administrators, teachers will unpack standards and FSA item specifications to ensure instruction aligns to the depth of grade-level standards including developing essential questions, lesson objectives, evaluating resources/ materials and differentiating activities/tasks based on individual student needs.</li> <li>3. The administration will provide opportunities for lesson studies by identifying model classrooms for centers and small group instruction and allow time for identified teachers to observe best practices.</li> <li>4. ESE teachers will take part in weekly common planning for all content areas and provide inut and guidance to classroom teachers on how to best support our Students with Disabilities.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)



<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Behavior
<b>Rationale</b>	27% of discipline actions of referrals resulted in suspensions. 69% of prior year's of referrals are due to incidents of confrontations/disputes or fighting.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	If we increase the use of restorative justice with focused topics and guided conversations on empathy, acceptance, diversity, peer cooperation, and problem-solving, then referrals based on incidents of bullying, teasing, and fighting will decrease by 50%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Utilize a jury of student peers to guide restorative justice practices and problem solve alternative discipline actions for referrals other than suspensions.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Suspension removes students from the classroom thus decreasing instructional time Restorative justice provides opportunities for students to learn from their behavior Increases student accountability for actions and how their actions affect the school community A jury of peers allows student input into school-wide behavior expectations thus creating student buy-in
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Select students for peer jury based on teacher recommendation</li> <li>2. Establish norms for peer jury</li> <li>3. Utilize peer jury when specific behavioral incidents (fighting, dispute/ confrontation) to determine discipline actions</li> <li>4. Review behavioral data monthly and track use of restorative practices</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@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).**

- School Safety
- Tint all 1st floor classroom windows in main building and building B and portables
  - Requested the district to provide additional fencing on front of school
  - Requested the district to replace glass in doors with mess/break-proof glass
  - Requested the district to replace chain locks with push bar locks on gates
  - Requested the district provide additional security guards (2 for school)
  - Requested the district provide "No Trespassing" signs around perimeter of school