

Duval County Public Schools

R. V. Daniels 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 | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

R. V. Daniels Elementary School

1951 W 15TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

Demographics

Principal: Johnny Bryant

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2015

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 93% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

R. V. Daniels Elementary School

1951 W 15TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

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 | 79% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 96% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | 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.

To implement gifted strategies to provide creative, analytical, and verbal learning experiences for students to explore their unique talents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every R.V.Daniels student will be inspired to unlock their unique potential in pursuit of life-long learning

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 |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Green, Katecia | Assistant Principal | She is to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, monitors the implementation of classroom instruction, MTSS, small differentiated groups, conducts assessment skills of school staff, ensures the implementation of intervention supports and documentation requirements, reviews student data, meets with MTSS/Rtl members, communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities. |
| Parker-Freeman, Valencia | Instructional Coach | She provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. She will assist in the design and development of intervention plans, Tier 3 interventions, and offer professional development and technical assistance. |

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 | 38 | 41 | 54 | 58 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 329 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 5 | 11 | 18 | 30 | 36 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |

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 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 18 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

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 | 11 | 25 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| Students retained two or more times | 32 | 32 | 39 | 22 | 19 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 |

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

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

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 | 9 | 15 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 7 | 6 | 16 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 8 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 5 | 16 | 34 | 35 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |

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 | 6 | 12 | 17 | 16 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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 | 62% | 50% | 57% | 63% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | 56% | 58% | 63% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 36% | 50% | 53% | 43% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 73% | 62% | 63% | 70% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | 63% | 62% | 55% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | 52% | 51% | 31% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 74% | 48% | 53% | 52% | 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 | 38 (0) | 41 (0) | 54 (0) | 58 (0) | 69 (0) | 69 (0) | 329 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 () | 6 () | 12 () | 7 () | 8 () | 8 () | 44 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 () | 3 (0) | 0 (0) | 7 (0) | 12 (0) | 2 (0) | 25 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 () | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 5 () | 11 (0) | 18 (0) | 30 (0) | 36 (0) | 19 (0) | 119 (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 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 58% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 50% | 13% | 57% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 61% | 52% | 9% | 58% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 49% | 27% | 56% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 74% | 50% | 24% | 56% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 51% | 24% | 55% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 74% | 61% | 13% | 62% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 59% | 19% | 62% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 57% | 64% | -7% | 64% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 94% | 60% | 34% | 62% | 32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -37% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -21% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 90% | 57% | 33% | 60% | 30% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 61% | 17% | 61% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 73% | 49% | 24% | 53% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 56% | 22% | 55% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 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 |
| ASN | 92 | 70 | | 100 | 97 | | 83 | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 50 | 32 | 63 | 43 | 25 | 63 | | | | |
| MUL | 100 | 70 | | 100 | 80 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 47 | 32 | 60 | 37 | 23 | 48 | | | | |
| 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 |
| ASN | 100 | 96 | | 100 | 92 | | 100 | | | | |
| BLK | 64 | 60 | 35 | 78 | 69 | 59 | 70 | | | | |
| MUL | 91 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 56 | 35 | 75 | 70 | 61 | 65 | | | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 93 | 85 | | 100 | 85 | | 96 | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | 58 | 39 | 59 | 45 | 32 | 30 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 52 | 41 | 59 | 44 | 37 | 31 | | | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| 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 | 400 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 88 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 47 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 88 |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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.

needs to be completed

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

needs to be completed

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.

needs to be completed

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

needs to be completed

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

needs to be completed

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

1. needs to be completed
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Lowest performing 25th percentile in ELA and Math |
| Rationale | After reviewing the school data we identified that our lowest performing 25th percentile in ELA and Math were significantly lower than last year. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Last year the lowest performing 25th percentile for ELA was 34% and last year the lowest performing 25th percentile for Math was 37%. If the standards are taught with fidelity and consistency our lowest performing 25th percentile in ELA and Math and align with the school's vision and mission, then student performance will increase by 20% in both areas. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | La Shawn Caldwell (blacksheal2@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <p>To increase our ELA foundational skills for our K-2 students we will purchase the Reading Mastery program. Our lowest performing 25th percentile for ELA 3-5 students we will purchase LLI kits, LAFS, Guided reading materials and manipulatives for all subject areas. Student will participate in field experiences in reading, math, science, and/or social studies during the 2019-2020 school year to enhance and align student learning experiences in and out of the classroom.</p> <p>To increase our Mathematical foundational skills for our lowest performing 25th percentile for math 3-5 students we will purchase the Acaletics program and MAFS.</p> <p>To enhance the core subject areas of ELA and Math, students will participate in field experiences involving science and/or social studies during the 2019-2020 school year to enhance and align student learning experiences in and out of the classroom.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | With the purchasing of the programs above we are building a strong foundation in the primary grades and remediating the foundational skills for students K-5. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will tier teachers to ensure academic support is provided with a reading coach. Reading Coach will provide tiered- support for K-5 ELA teachers through the Coaching Cycle. Reading Coach will meet with teachers to conduct on-going PLC's to create remediation/focus calendars for grades 3-5. Reading Coach and our instructional support team will pull our lowest performing 25th percentile students in grades 3-5 for targeted skill remediation in reading and math. Assistant Principal will plan weekly with teachers to monitor the progress of targeted students and will meet weekly with teachers to support instruction and collaborate in creating lessons to use during small group instruction. 2. Establish and utilize model classrooms for ELA and Math. 3. Administration and the Reading Coach will facilitate a peer observation learning experience through model classrooms that include the observation, debrief and follow-up practice for the focused shift. 4. Routine data chats involving all stakeholders (between students to teacher, teacher to teacher, teacher to coach, coach to admin administrator to teacher, administrator to administrator, teacher to parent, student to parent.) |

5. Data forms to track all students in ELA and Math, and Science (Data tracking forms evident in classrooms and used for lesson planning; reflections from previous lesson data to guide instruction, posted data on walls and in student notebooks; conversations with students and teachers).
6. Materials will be purchased to support lowest performing 25th percentile students for tutoring. Materials include but are not limited to LLI kits, Scholastic subscription, Time for Kids subscription, Highlights subscription, BrainPop subscription, and Study Island online subscription.
7. In school tutoring, before and after school tutoring for students after SAI funds are expended.
8. Membership to PMSQ Activate Reading for all Language Arts Teachers so they have access to researched-based materials online.
9. Transportation to field experiences to STARBASE, Riverkeeper, IMAX Theatre, Tree Hill, Jacksonville Zoo, Wild Adventures and other field studies.
10. Tutoring supplies for in school tutoring and before and after school tutoring.
11. Media Carts to assist with classroom instruction.
12. Headphones to assist with classroom instruction.
13. Instructional para professional to assist with small group instruction.

**Person
Responsible**

La Shawn Caldwell (blacksheal2@duvalschools.org)

| #2 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Culture and Climate (PBIS) If we improve student behavior through positive-based interventions and supports, then we will decrease the amount of negative behaviors creating a positive culture for all students and faculty. |
| Rationale | Based on discipline data and the PBIS team - Continue to decrease the amount of referrals and create positive-based systems. Based on data, our first goal needs to focus on building stronger relationships of care and support within the faculty and students. The data shows that our school climate and culture is reflecting the need for meaningful connections in order to build culture. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | If students and staff feel safe and valued, then RV Daniels Elementary School will foster a productive learning environment where students feel safe to take academic risks; thereby creating a positive school climate and culture for all stakeholders. This change in the culture and climate should improve our data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Katecia Green (greenk1@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Create systems to celebrate success including blending learning, reading goals, teacher recognition for creating positive classroom climates, and time for focused dialogue with colleagues. If we consistently collaborate with the PBIS team to work on implementing positive behavior systems within the classrooms and rewards systems for both teachers and students, then student engagement will increase and discipline referrals will decrease. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teach students through first week of school, the traffic patterns of school and expectations of behavior. 2. Consistent meetings with PBIS Team. 3. Following the calendar of incentives. 4. Eagle Bucks 5. Train teachers on the new Stanford Harmony: Social Emotional Learning Program to be implemented everyday using the meet up and buddy up. Create a school wide Hello for each week to invite all stakeholders to participate in the program strategies that support a healthy learning environment. Establish a model classroom using Harmony. 6. Train all faculty in using DOJO school wide. Align positive DOJO points with the School Guidelines. Teachers will invite admin, VE resource, and resource teachers to their class DOJO in order to provide positive feedback by all stakeholders. |
| Person Responsible | Katecia Green (greenk1@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.

needs to be completed

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.

needs to be completed

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

needs to be completed

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.

needs to be completed

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

needs to be completed

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Lowest performing 25th percentile in ELA and Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture and Climate (PBIS) | \$0.00 |

| | |
|--------|--------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|