Normandy Village Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Normandy Village Elementary School

8257 HERLONG RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/normandyvillage

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Sales

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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

Normandy Village Elementary School

8257 HERLONG RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/normandyvillage

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

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.

Our mission is to equip teachers, engage students and establish positive relationships with all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to cultivate a culture of academic and social achievement in all students that will prepare them for college and career opportunities.

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
Sales, Jessica	Principal	Provides instructional and organizational leadership, monitors fidelity of instruction to meet school-wide goals to ensure school improvement, monitors student data and adjusts goals to ensure continuous improvement.
Wright, Angela	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional and organizational leadership, monitors fidelity of instruction to meet school-wide goals to ensure school improvement, monitors student data and adjusts goals to ensure continuous improvement.
Kozlowski, Megan	Instructional Coach	Monitor student data, facilities faculty professional development that aligns with academic and climate goals, provides instructional coaching support to teachers and prepares and facilitates professional learning communities meetings.
Marshall, Stacy	Instructional Coach	Monitor student data, facilities faculty professional development that aligns with academic and climate goals, provides instructional coaching support to teachers and prepares and facilitates professional learning communities meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Jessica Sales

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.*
2

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	74	63	68	63	60	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	383
Attendance below 90 percent	30	32	20	25	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	1	8	5	4	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	35	54	49	39	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	42	53	52	43	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219

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	38	53	46	36	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

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	75	60	65	68	59	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	75	60	65	68	59	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	386
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	33%	50%	57%	29%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	41%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	41%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	54%	62%	63%	33%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	62%	36%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	51%	32%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	48%	53%	39%	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	36%	51%	-15%	58%	-22%
	2018	29%	50%	-21%	57%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	34%	49%	-15%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	38%	50%	-12%	56%	-18%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
	2018	38%	59%	-21%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
	2018	34%	60%	-26%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	51%	57%	-6%	60%	-9%
	2018	52%	61%	-9%	61%	-9%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison		17%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	41%	49%	-8%	53%	-12%	
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	55%	-10%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
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	17	52	47	24	61	60	7				
BLK	25	48	47	47	61	46	47				
HSP	43	55		67	58						
WHT	38	60		53	61	45	18				
FRL	29	55	56	50	65	46	35				
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	11	29		11	43	31					
BLK	34	57	58	44	67	71	39				
HSP	36			36	40						
WHT	35	38		40	54	40	75				
FRL	35	51	52	44	63	61	51				
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	9	29	33	20	33	25	14				
BLK	27	36	35	32	35	39	43				
HSP	46			21							
WHT	33	53		34	34		31				
FRL	24	39	44	33	33	30	40				

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	48
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	56

Hispanic Students	
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
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	48
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.

ELA Achievement was the component that shows the lowest performance last year.
Factor(s) contributing to the decline:
*Lack of fidelity to standards focused instruction in language arts
*Lack of practice with tasks to standards at grade level

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

Math L25 gains showed the greatest decline from prior year. This component declined by 14%.
Factor(s) contributing to the decline:

*Lack of strategic intervention work with this subgroup of students focused on remediation and standards-aligned instruction

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.

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.,
Factor(s) that contributed to this gap:
*Lack of fidelity to standards focused instruction in language arts
*Lack of practice with tasks to standards at grade level

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

Math achievement had a 10% increase, yielding the most improvement of all data components. Normandy Village implemented a supplementary program, Acaletics, in all of our 2nd-5th grade classes, which contributed to increased student proficiency on the state assessment.

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

One potential area of concern is our Student with Disabilities, as they fell below the ESSA Federal Index by 3%.

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

1. Full staffing by Day 1
2. Providing intensive support for instruction and classroom management to all novice and Tier 1 teachers
3. Implementing and monitoring implementation of curriculum, intervention and supplementary programs with fidelity
4. Data analysis and planning for intervention to support student achievement
5. Improve parent engagement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a leadership team, we will work to improve teacher feedback that is specific and advances teacher efficacy. Utilizing the 5 Essential teacher survey data, it was determined that an area of growth for our leadership team is to be more present in classrooms and to provide specific feedback to help teachers grow and improve. Leadership will promote a culture of feedback by asking teachers to set professional goals for themselves. By improving this leadership practice,we will have a direct impact on improved student learning as we work to improve teacher pedagogical skills that will improve their instructional planning, delivery of instruction, and assessment of student comprehension.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 50% of the faculty will strongly agree that leadership provides them regular, useful feedback that advances their professional practice as evidenced by their responses on the 2021 5 Essentials Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The administration team will visit teacher's classes weekly using the Standard Walk-Through Tool. Leadership will provide timely feedback on a specific area of focus for the teacher. This feedback will be used to coach teachers to help meet their professional growth goals this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It was noted in the 5 Essential Survey that this was an area of needed improvement for the leadership team. The Standard Walk-Through Tool is an observational tool that the district put in place for administration to observe standards based instruction in the classroom. The tool looks at 4 areas of standard based instruction to ensure the level of instruction meets the standard. Leadership will utilize this time to provide productive feedback to teachers that can shift their instructional planning practices that will lead to increased teacher efficacy and student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership team will create calendars to ensure classroom visits occur weekly. Visits will align with school-wide professional development and/or instructional foci outlined in PLC.
Key noticings in classrooms will be highlighted during PLC and staff meetings to celebrate instructional practice or classroom culture.

Person Responsible	Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Regular surveys will be conducted as a temperature check to ensure teachers' voices are a part of the instructional development practices for our school.

Person Responsible	Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Conduct monthly check-ins with teachers to facilitate one-on-one discourse with teachers to determine their needs,build teacher/principal trust and help retain highly qualified and new teachers from year to year.

Person Responsible	Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After a review of school-based classroom observation data, it was noted that the majority of our classes were inconsistent with developing tasks aligned to standards (60%) and assessing student learning during instruction (50%). When students and teachers were asked about the rigor experienced in classrooms in the 5 essentials survey, the majority replied that the rigor was adequate, indicating that students are experiencing the negative impact of the Opportunity Myth. Additionally, based on the teacher response to the 5 Essentials survey regarding collective responsibility, teacher responses indicated that they are not spending enough time collaborating through the use of instructional rounding and reviewing assessment data.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase lessons that incorporate task alignment to standard during observations by 35%. Increase lessons that incorporate checks for understanding that determine mastery during instruction observed by 30%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional planning that focuses on task alignment, instructional delivery and developing questions that demonstrate mastery. During planning, we will utilize the process of backwards planning to further focus teacher attention to deeper knowledge of the requirements of the standard, effective methods to assess learning during instruction and designing lessons that incorporate this new learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There is a plethora or research to support standards based instruction,planning, and relevant professional development: • Thompson's (2000) Learning Focused • Daggett's (2008) Rigor Relevance and Relationships • Hattie's (2009) High Effect Size Strategies • Knight's (2007) Instructional Coaching Our rationale for utilizing backwards planning is to ensure teachers are teaching the entire standard and successfully check for understanding during the course of instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate PLCs that focus on standards-aligned lesson planning that incorporates the use of student engagement strategies that accommodate all learning modalities. Utilization of tangible resources (ie manipulatives, technological resources and field experiences) to reinforce learning will be incorporated.

Person Responsible	Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate Data Chats that utilize data from multiple sources (ie. district PMAs, blended learning mastery checks, summative and formative school-based assessments) to realign instructional practice to increase teacher and student efficacy.

Person Responsible	Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

Provide professional development opportunities to deepen teacher efficacy and proficiency with facilitation of supplemental and intensive remediation programs (ie Acaletics,Freckle, Reading Intervention programs) to support the instructional needs of their students to increase student performance and proficiency.

Person Responsible	Megan Kozlowski (kozlowskim@duvalschools.org)

Fund tutor to support students utilizing high-yield strategies for Tier 2 and 3 instruction during the school day.

Person Responsible Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

Fund academic coaches (reading and math) to provide support to teachers when implementing best practices, disaggregate data to make instructional decisions to support improved student academic performance, and provide professional learning opportunities for teachers to improve practice.

Person Responsible Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Fund additional student laptops and laptop cart for student use of blended learning resources during Tier 2 and 2 instruction.

Person Responsible Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Fund ELA Performance Coach Workbooks to provide resources for supplemental instruction to students during Tier 2 and 3 instruction.

Person Responsible Megan Kozlowski (kozlowskim@duvalschools.org)

Fund Math and Science manipulatives and supplies to reinforce instruction for small group and independent practice.

Person Responsible Stacy Marshall (cribbs@duvalschools.org)

Fund educational field experiences that provide real-world exposure to standards-aligned instruction to improve student academic performance. Field experiences will be provided (in-person or virtually) to the Kennedy Space Center, the Jacksonville Zoo, the MOSH and Theater Works.

Person Responsible Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

Use of the Standards Walk-through tool to determine efficacy of the planning process and/or areas to improve practice. Refinement to the planning process will be made based on this review of our data.

Person Responsible Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Provide monthly TDE days for additional time to develop learning arcs and organize resources that can be used during instruction that are aligned to the standard. Also, utilize this time to create mastery checks to ensure students can show comprehension during instruction. Develop banks of small group remediation for students who do not display mastery.

Person Responsible Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Monthly PLC "Tune Up" data reviews to analyze student data and make instructional shifts based on student needs.

Person Responsible Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	52% of school-wide referrals were written for infractions by students in our General Education setting. Of those 77% were Class 2 offenses. Only 25% of teachers felt that their colleagues take responsibility for helping students to learn self control as evidenced by the 5 Essentials survey data. This is an alarmingly low rate for our school. Implementation of SEL curriculum and strategies needs to be a more consistent practice in our building to support improved student behavior and increased faculty ownership of teaching this appropriate behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	All classrooms will implement Calm Classroom strategies and the Sanford Harmony curriculum with fidelity. This should allow us to see a decrease of at least 25% of our level 2 infractions school-wide.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony curriculum is a social emotional learning curriculum that provides teachers the tools to teach students appropriate communication strategies that help them to build better connections and a sense of communication. Calm Classroom provides teachers with strategies to teach self-regulation that will be implemented school-wide at least three times daily.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the increased amount of time out of school and additional stressors that students may have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is imperative that we take ownership of teaching students how to positively manage their stress. Utilizing these techniques and curriculum will provide us with a consistent framework to follow school-wide and allow us to monitor the progress of our implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate staff training to implement Calm Classroom school-wide throughout the school year. Follow up school-wide training will be facilitated during Early Release PD time.

Person Responsible	Stacy Marshall (cribbs@duvalschools.org)

Identify model classrooms for Calm Classroom implementation. Record implementation to spotlight during faculty development and make available online as all teachers work to improve practice.

Person Responsible	Stacy Marshall (cribbs@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate staff training to implement Sanford Harmony curriculum on Wednesdays throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate the implementation of Character Education curriculum to provide students with opportunities to grow and develop a healthy self-awareness and how they contribute to society,beginning with our school community.

Person Responsible	Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

Fund Parental Involvement Liaison to increase parent engagement into the school community to provide support with positive reinforcement and social emotional learning initiatives.

Person Responsible   Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Progress monitor discipline data monthly and provide management support for teachers that are still reporting a high rate of level 2 disciplinary infractions in their classrooms.

Person Responsible   Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our School Leadership team will address all remaining schoolwide improvement priorities by:
1. Prioritizing staffing needs to ensure we are fully staffed on day 1
2. Support Novice Teachers through monthly meetings and regular temperature checks to meet their needs
3. Implementing and monitoring implementation of curriculum, intervention and supplementary programs with fidelity using weekly classroom visits, providing timely feedback, and addressing facilitation concerns during weekly PLCs.
4. Conducting weekly data analysis and planning for intervention to support student achievement
5. Improve parent engagement by offering virtual opportunities to engage with teachers in lieu of face-to-face meetings

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.

Communication is essential to building positive relationships with all stakeholders. At Normandy Village, we communicate frequently with stakeholders. There are newsletters sent home in Tuesday folder. Emails, phones calls, post on social media accounts, and updates to the school's website occur every Sunday. Teachers conduct parent conference to keep parents informed about the academic progress of the their children. The school collaborates with stakeholders through monthly SAC meetings and provide opportunities for input on school matters. The school has an open door policy where parents are invited to participate in various events such as family nights, open house, and back to school orientation.

The attached Parent & Family Engagement Plan provides an overview of how parents may develop active partnerships. Additionally, school officials have developed partnerships with multiple organizations and faith based partners to enhance student experiences and

engage stakeholders during the 2020-2021 school year. Organizations represented include:
Rise Church
Communities in School
Parent Academy (DCPS)
Delores Barr Weaver Policy Center
Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce
Westside Baptist Church
Allen Chapel A.M.E. Church

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: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$178,882.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$68,700.68
			Notes: Instructional Reading Coach (Megan Kozlowski)			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$67,325.36
			Notes: Math Instructional Coach (Stacy Marshall)			
	5900		2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$9,652.37
			Notes: Tutor			
	7800	390-Other Purchased Services	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,580.00
			Notes: Transportation costs for Field Experiences			
	5100	330-Travel	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$11,728.25
			Notes: Educational Field Experience Admissions costs			
	5100	510-Supplies	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,422.02
			Notes: Performance Coach Workbooks to be used as standards-based supplemental instruction			
	5100	510-Supplies	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$8,379.95
			Notes: Manipulatives and supplemental resources to support math and science instruction			
	5100	643-Capitalized Hardware and Technology-Related Infrastructure	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$8,094.00

			Notes: 12 student Lenovo laptops and 1 Bretford Cube Cart			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$9,450.38**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6100	160-Other Support Personnel	2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$9,450.38
			Notes: Parental Involvement Liaison (Atlin Otis)			
					Total:	**$188,333.01**