

Duval County Public Schools

# Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School

8000 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Julie Ehrenberg**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School

8000 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

### 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	No	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

### 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.

At Twin Lakes Academy Elementary we foster a sense of leadership in all of our students. We want our students to focus on becoming lifelong learners and seek to excel in all endeavors which will lead to achieving their dreams.

Wildcats LEAD: Learn, Excel, Achieve, Dream

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

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary is working together to Create Leaders for Life!

### 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
Robertson, Denise	Principal	Principal Denise Robertson leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. She leads observations, evaluations, professional development and data reviews. Mrs. Robertson works with PTA, SAC, Shared Decision making, and the MTSS Team.
Jones, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Melissa Jones coordinates testing, computer-based instruction programs and compiles data from Performance Matters. She leads discipline and parent relations for grades K-5. Ms. Jones coordinates SAC and serves on Shared Decision Making and MTSS. She coordinates SIP goals, conducts focus walks and observations, provides professional development and coaching to teachers.
	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Rick Kane coordinates attendance meetings and student scheduling, serves as textbook manager, and coordinates teacher and staff duties. He leads discipline and parent relations for grades K-5. Mr. Kane serves on SAC, Shared Decision Making, and MTSS. He coordinates PBIS goals, conducts focus walks and observations, and provides professional development and coaching to teachers.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2008, Julie Ehrenberg

**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.*

3

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

60

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A



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

## 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	149	159	133	151	169	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	926
Attendance below 90 percent	22	12	14	8	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	48	69	76	51	47	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	347
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	70	105	0	103	80	39	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	445

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	48	65	71	46	30	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

### 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	140	162	128	158	157	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	901
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	5	14	16	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

**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	149	159	133	151	169	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	926
Attendance below 90 percent	22	12	14	8	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	131	86	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321

**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	48	65	71	46	30	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301

**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	3	0	0	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	55%	50%	57%	59%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	59%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	50%	53%	54%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	62%	63%	65%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	62%	63%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	52%	51%	53%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	48%	53%	60%	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	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
	2018	61%	49%	12%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	56%	50%	6%	56%	0%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	59%	2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	55%	61%	-6%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	28	44	50	43	44	31	31				
ELL	26	38	24	43	58	31					
ASN	79	81		83	94						
BLK	41	41	52	57	55	27	46				
HSP	51	60	27	69	67	35	74				
MUL	57	56		76	67						
WHT	71	59	55	81	67		74				
FRL	42	50	52	61	60	34	56				
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	26	46	41	30	40	29	17				
ELL	26	56	69	43	53	45					
ASN	79	70		83	60		71				
BLK	41	52	54	47	50	33	46				
HSP	56	52	54	60	59		47				
MUL	67	39		79	72		75				
WHT	68	60	43	79	70	33	79				

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	48	53	53	54	33	48				
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	28	61	53	45	58	53	23				
ELL	26	50	55	53	63						
ASN	97	73		90	87						
BLK	45	56	67	51	52	37	54				
HSP	50	46	43	71	68	53	48				
MUL	59	70		63	78		50				
WHT	66	62	50	72	61	69	67				
FRL	47	60	58	51	52	47	46				

### 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	84
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	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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
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	68
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	53
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.**

Students with Disabilities

Disproportionate number of ESE teachers to service identified students with disabilities.

Lack of experience (teachers) to provide effective Tier II and Tier III instruction to identified and non-identified students with disabilities.

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

English Language Learners

Increased number of students identified via WIDA testing with no increase inservices or support.

Increased number of students enrolling that have no previous school experience.

**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.**

Math students in our Lowest Performing Quartile. 45 state average/34 school average.

Lack of differentiation of instruction for identified students. Low attendance of LPQ (2 or more EWS).

Lack of prerequisite skills or content knowledge (identified students).

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

Math Proficiency and Learning Gains.

Instruction implemented with fidelity. Strong Core Instruction. Differentiated small group instruction/ interventions to address deficits.

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

Attendance (percentage of students missing 10 or more days) mainly in the younger grades has an adverse affect on academic achievement and strengthening the foundational skills.

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

1. English Language Learners- language proficiency
2. Students with disabilities- not adequately progressing/making gains
3. Lowest Performing Quartile Math Learning Gains- data holding steady, but not adequately progressing
4. Lowest Performing Quartile ELA Learning Gains - data slowly declining, but not adequately progressing
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ELL population has consistently increased from 5% in 2018 to over 12% in 2020. The percentage of students with no prior schooling has significantly increased and this creates a challenge to effectively meet their academic needs. The majority of these students fall into the Lowest Performing Quartile and this contributes to the overall decline in performance of the LPQ.

**Measurable Outcome:** By 2020-2021 increase the overall Federal Index for English Language Learners from 40% to 41%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement culturally responsive instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Wrap around support needed for all ELL students that will meet the academic and social emotional needs of the students. It allows administration to strategically support teachers, staff, students, and families.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Strategically schedule ELL students

**Person Responsible** Melissa Jones (jonesm1@duvalschools.org)

2. Utilize District ESOL Department to facilitate and support professional development of teachers.

**Person Responsible** Rick Kane (kaner@duvalschools.org)

3. Strategic scheduling of ESOL Paras to support ELL students and teachers.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Jones (jonesm1@duvalschools.org)

4. Careful progress monitoring of ELL students.

**Person Responsible** Rick Kane (kaner@duvalschools.org)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The majority of these students fall into the Lowest Performing Quartile and this contributes to the overall decline in performance of the LPQ.

**Measurable Outcome:** By 2020-2021 increase the overall Federal Index for Students with Disabilities from 39% to 41%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement research-based targeted instructional strategies to increase academic achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Wrap around support needed for all Students with Disabilities that will meet the academic and social emotional needs of the students. It allows administration to strategically support teachers, staff, students, and families.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teach in small interactive groups.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

2. Present and assess learning in multiple ways.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

3. Arrange classroom for maximizing attention.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

4. Use formal systems for behavioral and social-emotional change.

**Person Responsible** Cristina Seiler Seiler (lopezseilerc@duvalschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on the results of the 5 Essentials Survey, we need to focus on strengthening relationships among all stakeholders. This includes improving communication, enhancing the community to build a sense of trust, strengthening the relationships among colleagues, and participating in reflective dialogue focused on student learning.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>By 2020-2021 increase the overall category of Collective Responsibility (5 Essentials Survey) from 6% to 13%.</p> <p>By 2020-2021 increase the overall category of Teacher-Principal Trust (5 Essentials Survey) from 41% to 46%.</p> <p>By 2020-2021 increase the overall category of Reflective Dialogue (5 Essentials Survey) from 16% to 25%.</p> <p>By 2020-2021 increase the overall category of Student Responsibility (5 Essentials Survey) from 20% to 25%.</p> <p>By 2020-2021 increase the overall category of Teacher-Parent Trust (5 Essentials Survey) from 21% to 26%.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Create a professional learning community that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Based on the results of the 5 Essentials Survey and subsequent stakeholders focus groups, stakeholders expressed a need for a more collaborative culture where trusted relationships can grow, flourish, and impact student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Quarterly Culture Talks between Principal and Teachers/Staff

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

2. Learning communities convene regularly and frequently during the workday to engage in collaborative professional learning to strengthen their practice and increase student results.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

3. Learning community members are accountable to one another to achieve the shared goals of the school and school system and work in transparent, authentic settings that support their improvement.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

4. Stakeholder Coffee Talk with the Principal

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on the results of the 5 Essentials Survey, we need to enhance the feeling of safety among students.
---	---

<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By 2020-2021 increase the overall category of Student Safety (5 Essentials Survey) from 28% to 35%.
----------------------------	---

<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
---	---------------------

<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Provide students with the academic, emotional, and social skills necessary to improve their feelings of safety.
---------------------------------	---

<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Based on 5 Essentials Student Focus Group, students voiced their concerns and misconceptions on school safety.
---	--

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Quarterly Focus Groups with Students

<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cristina Seiler Seiler (lopezseilerc@duvalschools.org)
---------------------------	--

2. Provide students with statistical information around school safety.

<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cristina Seiler Seiler (lopezseilerc@duvalschools.org)
---------------------------	--

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based upon the 2019-2020 Standards Walk Through Tool data, 30% (0.6/2.0) of classroom show Standards-aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. The Standards-Based School Continuum (moderate rating in both Standards-based Planning and Aligned Observations) validates the results of the Standards Walk Through Tool. According to the 2020 5 Essentials Survey, teachers rate their Collaborative Practices as Neutral (49), which is consistent over a two year period.

**Measurable Outcome:** 75% (1.5/2.0) of classrooms observed will indicate standards alignment of instruction, tasks, and assessments, utilizing learning arcs, as measured by the Standards Walk Through Tool by January 2021.  
90% (1.8/2.0) of classrooms observed will indicate standards alignment of instruction, tasks, and assessments, utilizing learning arcs, as measured by the Standards Walk Through Tool by April 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Build a culture of standards-based instruction, with all content areas teachers, through focused common planning, utilizing Learning Arcs, that aligns materials, tasks, and assessments as evidenced in the Standards Walk Through tool.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The culture of standards-based focused practices and incorporation of the Learning Arcs is key to the alignment of instruction, tasks, and assessments that impact student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Utilize student work to facilitate deep conversation around the standards and Learning Arcs that impact instruction, tasks, and assessments.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Conduct frequent Standards Walk Throughs to produce actionable next steps and provide actionable and specific feedback to teachers following each classroom observation and common planning session.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Follow through in grade level common planning and quarterly data dives to monitor the effectiveness of tasks, materials, and assessments .

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Identify and use (grade level/content area) teacher leaders to create a sense of ownership by facilitating standards based common planning.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Calibrate with Assistant Principals to ensure a deeper understanding of Learning Arc, standards implementation, and evidence in both teacher actions and student work.

**Person Responsible** Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- 1. Invite business and faith-based partners to meet with school admin team to discuss ways in which our partnerships can strengthen our relationships and communication.**
- 2. Develop a plan through which teachers are more supportive of student needs through class meetings and daily Sanford Harmony Meet Ups.**
- 3. Review and enhance all modes of parent communication including but not limited to Blackboard, School Newsletter, agenda planners, and social media.**

## 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.

Parents are welcome at all times. Simply put: families make the difference. We have a very strong core group of PTA and SAC. They are involved in initiatives with teachers that impact our students. Initiatives such as the Penguin patch, Every Drop Counts Fundraiser, BINGO Night, Mothers' Day Cake, Book Fairs, Yearbook, and the School Dance.

We see building strong, positive relationships and maintaining transparency as the core foundation of our school culture. This is established and maintained through our school-wide implementation of Covey's 7 Habits, Sanford Harmony, Calm Classroom, and Growth Mindset. Paramount in our effort to maintain transparency with all stakeholders, we utilize all forms of social media; including Facebook, school website, Twitter, Weekly Principal email/voice/text messaging through Duval Connect, and school DoJo. Our goal for all staff in our school is to foster positive relationships with students and among peers maintaining our positive climate and culture through continuous communication and collaboration. These include rewarding good behavior with "pawsitive" awards, Meet Ups/Buddy Ups, and Buddy Classes (pairing primary and intermediate classrooms).

As a Leadership school, we provide multiple opportunities for students such as Girls on the Run, TECHNOCATS (broadcasting), Safety Patrols, Yearbook Club, Green Team, Teachers of Tomorrow, Peer Mediators, and Student Council.

SAC plays an integral role in the development of school improvement initiatives. SAC is comprised of active community members, parents, school representatives, and faith-based partners. This team provides valuable input into safety decisions, budgetary decisions, and overall school improvement. Monthly meetings are conducted which includes the Annual Mid-Year Stakeholders' Meeting that delves deeply into

student achievement data.

Input is gathered from students, staff, parents through surveys and focus groups. Focus groups include our quarterly Staff Culture Talks, 5 Essentials Survey Focus Group with students, 5 Essentials Survey Focus Groups with teachers, and Annual Coffee with the Principal and parents/school community.

#### **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: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00