

Duval County Public Schools

Crown Point Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Crown Point Elementary School

3800 CROWN POINT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

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

Demographics

Principal: Brett Hartley

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2019-20 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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 is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Crown Point Elementary School

3800 CROWN POINT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We live to learn and love to lead. We are CPE!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are leaders who apply our learning to achieve at least one year's growth in one year's time.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hartley, Brett	Principal	Principal Brett Hartley leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. He leads observations, evaluations, professional development and data reviews. Mr. Hartley works with PTA, SAC, Shared Decision Making, and the Lighthouse Team. Mr. Hartley oversees the math leadership team and leads common planning for K-5 mathematics and science.
Sanders, Yolanda	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Yolanda Sanders coordinates student scheduling, serves as textbook manager, and compiles data through Performance Matters. She leads discipline and parent relations for grades 3-5. She conducts focus walks and observations, and provides professional development and coaching to teachers.
Lowndes, Almarene	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Robyn White coordinates testing, computer-based instruction programs and compiles data from Performance Matters. She leads discipline and parent relations for K-2. Ms. White oversees faith-based and business partnerships and assists with our SAC committee. She conducts focus walks and observations, and provides professional development and coaching to teachers. She leads common planning with ELA for K-5.
Repper, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Provide targeted support for teachers and students in the area of reading
Driver, Dana	Instructional Coach	Provide targeted support for teachers and students in the area of math
Olivares, Nicolas	Instructional Coach	Provide targeted support for teachers and students in the area of science
Stephenson, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Richmond, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2015, Brett Hartley

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2019-20 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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 .	

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	136	139	143	150	145	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	873
Attendance below 90 percent	20	18	22	35	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	3	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	66	91	85	81	50	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	84	106	104	100	38	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469

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	64	88	81	82	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387

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	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 5/19/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	135	143	147	139	142	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	864
Attendance below 90 percent	0	41	37	36	30	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	38	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	1	1	3	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	
Number of students enrolled	135	143	147	139	142	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	864
Attendance below 90 percent	0	41	37	36	30	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	38	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	1	1	3	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	52%	50%	57%	55%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	53%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	47%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	63%	68%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	62%	58%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	48%	53%	61%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
	2018	43%	50%	-7%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	40%	50%	-10%	56%	-16%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	54%	57%	-3%	60%	-6%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	49%	-1%	53%	-5%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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	13	27	25	27	43	47	13				
ELL	25	65	71	42	75	69	7				
ASN	62			100							
BLK	45	47	36	51	55	36	48				
HSP	37	55	67	53	68	63	40				
MUL	52	50		58	65						
WHT	63	62	42	75	66	43	69				
FRL	43	52	44	53	62	51	47				
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	12	23	29	29	42	43	30				
ELL	24	52	53	49	58	59	50				
ASN	80			100							
BLK	48	46	40	52	58	61	62				
HSP	47	62	47	62	61	60	76				
MUL	55	61		71	50		82				
WHT	61	59	38	68	50	24	73				

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
FRL	48	57	46	57	52	41	68				
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	24	29	27	37	48	39	33				
ELL	27	44	59	42	47	38	21				
ASN	92			100							
BLK	41	52	48	58	53	35	40				
HSP	47	57	52	61	50	35	44				
MUL	59	44		70	65						
WHT	61	51	48	73	61	46	73				
FRL	47	52	45	60	55	40	61				

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 with the lowest performance were students in the lowest 25th percentile for both ELA and Math at 49%. A factor contributing to this was that the majority of these students were also SWD and/or ELL.

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

The component with the greatest decline from the year prior was the 5th grade ELA achievement. Of the three teachers for the content, two were on maternity leave beginning in March through the end of the year. The third teacher was a beginning teacher and it was her first year teaching 5th grade ELA.

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.

The component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was achievement of the SWD subgroup at 28%. Many of these students are working well below grade level and need additional interventions and supports to close learning gaps. Of the teachers who support SWD, two are novice teachers with less than 3 years experience.

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

The data component with the most improvement was 4th grade ELA achievement for this cohort. These students increased 11%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Achievement for students with disabilities

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

1. Achievement for students with disabilities
2. Lowest Performing Quartile learning gains
3. Student achievement (3 or higher)
4. Learning gains
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Over the past 2 years, students in the SWD subgroup have performed below 32%. The percentage of students achieving at a level 1 is greater than both the state and district average.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, the federal index for students with disabilities will increase to at least 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	If instruction is planned and differentiated to meet both student needs and the expectation of the standards, then student achievement will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With multiple years of low performance, the student achievement gaps have increased. Students will need support and targeted instruction with accessing grade level content as well as instruction at the independent level to accelerate learning and close achievement gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coaches and gen ed teachers will provide ESE teachers with mentoring and job-embedded coaching regarding high impact strategies within specific content areas. "By offering support, feedback, and intensive, individualized professional learning, coaching promises to be a better way to improve instruction in schools (<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ757367>).

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Administration will create and monitor support schedules that maximize the time ESE teachers can provide needed support to students with classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Instructional coaches and administration will provide support with planning for core and small group instruction to both gen ed and ESE teachers.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Priority scheduling will be provided for tutoring support given to students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Historical data for both achievement and learning gains shows periods of growth followed by dips in all 7 school grade components. There is a need to create sustainable growth in all areas that will lead to continued increases in achievement as well as learning gains. According to the 19-20 5 Essentials data, our score decreased by 13 points from 69 to 56 in the area of Quality Professional Development.

Measurable Outcome: FSA ELA Reading Proficiency: 57%
 FSA ELA Reading Gains: 60%
 FSA ELA Lowest Performing Quartile Gains: 55%
 FSA MATH Proficiency: 68%
 FSA MATH Gains: 67%
 FSA MATH Lowest Performing Quartile Gains: 55%
 SSA SCIENCE Proficiency: 72:
 2021 5 Essentials Data for Quality Professional Development: 75

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: If instruction is planned and differentiated to meet both student needs and the expectation of the standards, then student achievement will increase.
 "Results indicate that in classrooms where differentiated instruction methods were systematically employed, students made better progress compared to students in classrooms where differentiated instruction methods were not employed, the family's socioeconomic status did not lead to differentiation in students' achievement and the quality of differentiated teaching had a corresponding effect on students' achievement" (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0191491X15000188>).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With multiple years of inconsistent growth, students will need support and targeted instruction with accessing grade level content as well as instruction on the independent level to accelerate learning and close achievement gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Create an official professional development system that includes a team with representation from all grade levels that will meet monthly to plan and implement PD.

Person Responsible: Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Administration and instructional coaches will work with the professional development team to provide strategies and support for lesson planning and implementation. This support will include how to effectively use technology, such as document cameras and NEC projectors, to enhance student engagement and learning. "By offering support, feedback, and intensive, individualized professional learning, coaching promises to be a better way to improve instruction in schools (<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ757367>).

Person Responsible: Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

A PLC / common planning schedule will be created to meet with teachers for 90 minutes every other week as opposed to 35 minutes each week.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Using the Leader in Me program, each grade level will develop leadership portfolios with all students. These portfolios will allow students to create their own goals and track their achievement throughout the year. We want students to be committed to working hard to achieve their goals and persist even when things get difficult. We also want students to feel excited to learn as much as they can in class and actively work toward their goals.

"Leader in Me schools help students and staff build the skills and competencies necessary for student achievement. Leader in Me prepares and supports teachers to create goal-centered, student-led classrooms that empower students to lead their own learning. Leader in Me empowers students with the mindsets, skills, and supportive environment they need to lead their academic achievement." Research highlighting positive effects of LIM can be found at <https://www.leaderinme.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Research-Research-Guide-2.0.pdf>.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

The professional learning team will study the three key findings from the book How People Learn. These key findings will be used during PLC time. The findings are:

1. Students come to the classroom with preconceptions about how the world works. If their initial understanding is not engaged, they may fail to grasp the new concepts and information that are taught, or they may learn them for the purpose of a test, but revert to their pre-conceptions outside the classroom.
2. To develop competence in an area of inquiry, students must:
 - a. have a deep foundation of factual knowledge,
 - b. understand facts and ideas in the context of a conceptual framework, and
 - c. organize knowledge in ways that facilitate retrieval and application.
3. A metacognitive approach to instruction can help students learn to take control of their own learning by defining learning goals and monitoring their progress toward achieving them.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The professional learning team will create professional development sessions specific to the strategy of student-to-student discussion. This is an area where we are in the red (37) according to our 5 Essentials data.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When analyzing Crown Point's data from the 2019-2020 Standards Walk-Through Dashboard, we noticed that instruction matching the focus board and student task alignment was at 84%. We specifically noticed that teachers are not providing opportunities for students to productively struggle. The data shows that while the materials were aligned, teachers need additional support during PLC & common planning time to use the learning arcs to select aligned tasks.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers consistently assign tasks and activities that completely align with the standards, along with releasing learning to the students, then our task alignment score will be at a 90% or above.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Leverage PLC's and common planning to strengthen teacher's knowledge on how to use the learning arcs to select tasks that are appropriately aligned to the grade-level standards. Evidence will consist of completed learning arcs from grades K-5, examples of the tasks assigned to students, and data on the standards walk-through dashboard collected using the standards walk-through tool.</p> <p>According to our 5 Essentials data, we scored low on teacher influence over curriculum and strategies for learning. We hope to improve in this area through collaborative planning with teachers and offering them autonomy on selecting tasks that align with the standards. .</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Since we have a new assistant principal on the team, we will create a schedule that allows admin to weekly visit two classrooms at the same time for calibration purposes.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

We will integrate discussions on alignment findings into already scheduled admin and leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Instructional coaches will be trained on the standards walk-through tool and invited to attend instructional walks.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Introduce the learning arc process to K-2 teams and review the process with 3-5 teams. Admin and instructional coaches will facilitate the learning arc work during PLC and common planning time, which will occur 90 minutes every other week.

Person Responsible Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

Beginning no later than the start of the 2nd semester, begin releasing the learning arc work to the teachers without direct facilitation from admin or instructional coaches. Admin will read over the work created by the teachers and provide direct feedback. Please note that admin and instructional coaches will still be a part of common planning, however, they will not be in front of the room leading step-by-step.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will continue to use our Leader in Me action teams to address other concerns throughout the year.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Crown Point will continue to participate in the Leader in Me program. We will continue to build student leadership and accountability that will apply to life at home and at school. Parent involvement events will be planned and implemented to inform and engage parents in their students' learning. Parents will receive support in partnering with their child to reach their individually set goals and achieve success.

Partnerships with both faith-based and business partners will continue to be built and utilized to support the school community. Currently, five faith-based partners have been established and their efforts are being coordinated through quarterly meetings with representatives present from each. We are working closely with them to best utilize the abilities and talents each provide to impact the school. Business partnerships are being built and established in order to meet needs for program implementation and to build community awareness of services to support families.

Within the Leader in Me framework, we have 7 action teams in which all faculty and staff members meet monthly at a minimum. Those teams are:

1. Professional Learning
2. Student Learning
3. Community Learning
4. Leadership Environment
5. Leadership Events

- 6. Shared Leadership
- 7. Student Achievement

Using the work and ideas from each of these teams, we are able to positively impact the school culture and environment in positive ways. We take data from surveys such as the 5 Essentials and the MRA to make decisions that are best for the school.

To aid in creating a safe and inviting space for students to learn and lead, we are using Title 1 funds to purchase an additional school counselor. Our counselors work with students both in whole group and small group settings. They are instrumental in implementing our SEL programs we have at Crown Point.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00