

Duval County Public Schools

Twin Lakes Academy Middle 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

Demographics

Principal: Aurelia Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
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* Native American Students* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (53%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide every student, in every classroom, every day with a safe, caring, engaging and challenging learning environment that promotes the rigorous and relevant educational experiences necessary to perform at or above grade level standards.

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
Williams, Aurelia	Principal	Facilitate the leadership team meetings where we will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Shaw, Sharonette	Assistant Principal	As the Math Instructional Lead and AP of Student Services, AP Shaw will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Bean-Pinkney, Jo-den	Teacher, K-12	As the ELA teacher and part time Reading Coach, Mrs. Bean will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Bryan, Molly	Teacher, ESE	As the FRVE, Ms. Bryan will review academic and behavior Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 2 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Townsend, Michael	Assistant Principal	As the Science and Social Studies Instructional Lead and AP of Curriculum, AP Townsend will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Carter, Anoda	Teacher, Career/Technical	As the CTE teacher, Ms. Carter will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Curry, Sequan	School Counselor	As the School Counselor, Mr. Curry will review academic and behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Stein, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	As the Math Lead teacher, Ms. Stein will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Madison, Felecia	Teacher, K-12	As the Social Studies Lead, Mrs. Madison will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Jones, David	Teacher, K-12	As the Science Lead, Mr. Jones will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.

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	0	0	0	0	0	407	399	420	0	0	0	0	1226
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	75	58	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	172	146	0	0	0	468

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	49	0	0	0	0	148

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

49

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	99	105	0	0	0	0	277
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	47	59	0	0	0	0	181
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	46	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	289	325	273	0	0	0	0	887

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	146	147	0	0	0	0	423

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	48%	43%	54%	48%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	49%	54%	49%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	45%	47%	41%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	53%	49%	58%	45%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	50%	57%	40%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	47%	51%	36%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	57%	44%	51%	50%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	68%	72%	64%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	407 (0)	399 (0)	420 (0)	1226 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	48 ()	75 ()	58 ()	181 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	150 (0)	172 (0)	322 (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
06	2019	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
	2018	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
	2018	42%	41%	1%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	54%	49%	5%	56%	-2%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
	2018	40%	42%	-2%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	37%	47%	-10%	54%	-17%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	54%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	32%	32%	0%	46%	-14%
	2018	42%	31%	11%	45%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	40%	4%	48%	-4%
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	67%	30%	67%	30%
2018	98%	63%	35%	65%	33%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	69%	3%	71%	1%
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
Compare		-26%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	57%	22%	61%	18%
2018	98%	61%	37%	62%	36%
Compare		-19%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	61%	37%	57%	41%
2018	96%	57%	39%	56%	40%
Compare		2%			

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	46	46	28	51	46	28	58	77		
ELL	20	49	52	30	43	43	21	55	67		
ASN	58	73	58	74	60		75	80	71		
BLK	35	48	48	39	44	40	41	65	81		
HSP	41	51	53	47	46	38	42	68	79		
MUL	58	48	42	64	58	58	79	96	89		
WHT	59	57	53	63	58	43	68	84	84		
FRL	38	53	53	42	47	39	41	68	78		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	37	31	28	42	37	20	55			
ELL	18	41	35	31	50	45	22				
ASN	71	61		75	68		90	100	90		
BLK	35	44	32	40	52	49	40	98	81		
HSP	37	46	42	42	52	52	34	97	89		
MUL	52	44		51	61	47	47	100	73		
WHT	56	52	37	66	63	55	67	94	84		
FRL	37	44	34	42	52	50	43	95	80		
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	13	36	38	17	34	41	13	45			
ELL	11	31	32	22	38	34	20	25			
ASN	72	74		72	63		61	94	96		
BLK	32	41	44	30	36	39	32	50	70		
HSP	40	44	26	39	43	39	41	51	70		
MUL	58	54		49	36	33	56	88	71		
WHT	59	54	43	54	40	26	65	74	80		
FRL	36	44	37	32	35	36	38	51	71		

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	43
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	69
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	49
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	51
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	66
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	62
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	51
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.

BQ Math component showed the lowest performance. One teacher to resign and another went out on leave due to his wife medical issue. The students missed out on daily effective instruction with a teacher who skill sets can meet the individual needs of students instead of the needs of the group.

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

Civics showed the lowest performance. The rationale is that we only had (85) students who were gifted in the course the previous year and the 2018-2019 school year we had (385) students with (115) students with a lexile under 600.

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.

BQ Math component showed the lowest performance. One teacher to resign and another went out on leave due to his wife medical issue. The students missed out on daily effective instruction with a teacher who skill sets can meet the individual needs of students instead of the needs of the group.

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

BQ Reading component showed the most improvement. The Reading Coach became an Interventionist and worked with our students who were less than ten points away from the next proficiency bucket. The District Specialist worked with students in small groups who hadn't mastered three of our highly assessed standards.

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

Level 1 on Statewide Assessment and Attendance below 90%

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

1. Math
2. Language Arts
3. School Climate and Culture
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Academic-Math
Rationale	Based on the Math data, we should have a laser focus approach on being strategic and intentional with how we address and meet the individual academic needs of students. The data revealed that some of the students who should have made gains or proficiency based on previous data did not make gains or proficiency based on the 2019 FSA data.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we implement and progress monitor with fidelity individualized prescriptions fully aligned with grade level expectations in math, then student achievement will increase in math. We will use iReady, Math 180, District quarterly assessment, and teacher developed common assessment for progress monitoring. If all successful, then our goal of Math proficiency 55%, Math Bottom Quartile 55%, and Math Learning Gains 56% will be attained.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sharonette Shaw (shaws@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Allow time for teachers to collaborate and engage in professional learning opportunities involving analysis of student achievement data, the creation of individualized prescriptions with prescriptive strategies and the opportunity to unpacking standards to ensure the alignment of tasks and assessments are measuring the depth of standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using the individualized prescriptions to progress monitor student achievement, teachers will consistently collect student achievement data to review and assess growth as determined by grade level cut scores. We will use iReady, Math 180, District quarterly assessment, and teacher developed common assessment for progress monitoring.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing teachers time during Early Release professional development sessions to progress monitor and collaborate with peers in disaggregating student data, identifying prescriptive interventions and resources, and developing activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' instructional strengths based on student prescriptions. 2. Provide teachers with the learning opportunity to participate in common planning sessions with administration and District Specialist to review data from current assessments and utilize data trackers to identify and progress monitor learning. 3. Model the process of creating and monitoring effective prescriptive sets 4. Use resources such as a Standard Protocol to ensure standard based instruction and aligned tasks and assessments are being used to measure the depth of standards. 5. Admin will complete Standards Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing PLCs as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.
Person Responsible	Sharonette Shaw (shaws@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Academic-ELA
Rationale	Based on the ELA/Reading data, we should have a laser focus approach on being strategic and intentional with how we address and meet the individual academic needs of students. The data revealed that some of the students who should have made gains or proficiency based on previous data did not make gains or proficiency based on the 2019 FSA data.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we implement and progress monitor with fidelity individualized prescriptions fully aligned with grade level expectations in literacy, then student achievement will increase in literacy. We will use Achieve 3000 lexile growth, Achieve 3000 extended response and writing, District quarterly assessment, and teacher developed common assessment for progress monitoring. If all successful, then our goal of ELA/Reading proficiency 52%, ELA/Reading Bottom Quartile 53%, and ELA/Reading Learning Gains 56% will be attained.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Allow time for teachers to collaborate and engage in professional learning opportunities involving analysis of student achievement data, the creation of individualized prescriptions with prescriptive strategies and the opportunity to unpacking standards to ensure the alignment of tasks and assessments are measuring the depth of standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using the individualized prescriptions to progress monitor student achievement, teachers will consistently collect student achievement data to review and assess growth as determined by grade level cut scores. We will use Achieve 3000 lexile growth, Achieve 3000 extended response and writing, District quarterly assessment, and teacher developed common assessment for progress monitoring.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing teachers time during Early Release professional development sessions to progress monitor and collaborate with peers in disaggregating student data, identifying prescriptive interventions and resources, and developing activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' instructional strengths based on student prescriptions. 2. Provide teachers with the learning opportunity to participate in common planning sessions with administration and District Specialist to review data from current assessments and utilize data trackers to identify and progress monitor learning. 3. Model the process of creating and monitoring effective prescriptive sets 4. Use resources such as a Standard Protocol to ensure standard based instruction and aligned tasks and assessments are being used to measure the depth of standards. 5. Admin will complete Standards Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing PLCs as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Behavioral
Rationale	Based on the 5 Essentials data, we need to build a stronger and more supportive learning for students. The data shows that our school climate and culture is effecting the academic growth of our students and school. It has improved, but there is still work to be done.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we build a more cultural sensitive learning environment for students, then we will increase student engagement and maximize students presence in the classroom as evident by our 5 Essentials survey moving from very weak to strong in the Supportive Environment area.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Townsend (townsendm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Allow time for teachers to collaborate and engage in professional learning opportunities addressing being a culturally sensitive learning environment. Provide students a voice in how they learn and listen to their learning needs. Encourage teachers to build solid relationships with students and parents.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on the 5 Essentials data, we need to build a stronger and more supportive learning for students. The data shows that our school climate and culture is effecting the academic growth of our students and school. Under the supportive environment, we scored very weak on Peer Support for Learning and Student-Teacher trust.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue with Wolves Den and TLAM Bucks as incentive for positive behavior 2. Restorative Justice and Peer Mediation 3. Professional Development on creating a culturally sensitive learning environment 4. Identify networks of support offered to students at school 5. Continue with effective and consistence communication between school and home
Person Responsible	Michael Townsend (townsendm@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).