New Berlin Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

New Berlin Elementary School

3613 NEW BERLIN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

http://www.duvalschools.org/newberlin

Demographics

Principal: Raquel Foxworth

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan 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

New Berlin Elementary School

3613 NEW BERLIN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

http://www.duvalschools.org/newberlin

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 KG-5	No	37%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

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.

New Berlin is committed to Excellence and Learning for All.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower each learner to reach their highest potential.

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
Lewis, Crystal	Principal	Additional school leaders (not available to select from drop-down above): -Ashley Moore, Assistant Principal (starsa@duvalschools.org) -Armerdra Merksion, Assistant Principal (merkisona@duvalschools.org) -Gina Masculine, Guidance Counselor -Jesse Shugart, Guidance Counselor -Katie Burns, Kindergarten Teacher -Juan Taplin, 1st Grade Teacher -Trescha Nichols, 2nd Grade Teacher -Sarah Milenchick, 3rd Grade Teacher -Hannah Sorrow, 4th Grade Teacher -Laurel Cox, 5th Grade Teacher -Brenda Elliott, VE Teacher -Adam Przymylski, PE Teacher Principal and Assistant Principal Job Duties and Responsibilities: -Lead the MTSS team and Leadership team in bi-weekly meeting focus on implementing the school vision and mission - Disseminates information in a timely manner - Monitors and supports and use of data-based decisionmaking - Ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rt - Conducts frequent assessments of RtI skills of the school staff - Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation - Ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation - Communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Guidance Counselors Job Duties and Responsibilities: - Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students - Organizes MRT meetings - Works with teachers to provide support for the students' academic, emotional, behavioral and social success - Provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators - - Provides group and individual student interventions - Conducts direct observation of student behavior - Conducts Child Safety Matters lessons in classrooms - Support implementation of Sanford Harmony curriculum Teacher Job Duties and Responsibilities: - Attend summer and weekly leadership team meetings - Develop a sense of teamwork that contributes to high morale - Take the initiative to understand the "big picture" of making a school work and support the mission/vision of the school - Review faculty handbook with team - Conduct weekly team meetings - Ensure information is forwarded in a timely manner and report grade-level response/ consensus as needed - Verify grade level representation for all committees and emphasize the importance of participation

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		- Assign responsibilities for field trips - Assign responsibilities for weekly/monthly parent letter to send via DoJo - Assign responsibilities for monthly minutes and ensure all are posted online - Ensure protocol is followed when addressing concerns - Read all communication in a timely manner in order to serve as a team resource.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/29/2020, Raquel Foxworth

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.*

5

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%)
	2017-18: A (71%)
	2016-17: A (71%)
	2015-16: B (61%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

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	182	216	219	203	188	211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1219
Attendance below 90 percent	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		
Course failure in ELA	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		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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		

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/2/2020

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	193	211	190	184	206	227	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1211
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	2	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	0	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	10	10	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	7	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	193	211	190	184	206	227	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1211
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	2	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	0	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	10	10	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	73%	50%	57%	68%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	50%	53%	55%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	62%	63%	85%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	63%	62%	77%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	51%	76%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	48%	53%	74%	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	76%	51%	25%	58%	18%
	2018	81%	50%	31%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	52%	18%	58%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	49%	24%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	66%	50%	16%	56%	10%
	2018	66%	51%	15%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	64%	23%	64%	23%
	2018	86%	60%	26%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	72%	57%	15%	60%	12%
	2018	84%	61%	23%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	49%	24%	53%	20%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	43	42	45	59	50	47	45				
ASN	85	87		100	93						
BLK	67	61	67	77	65	55	66				
HSP	76	63		84	72		73				
MUL	68	54		77	69						
WHT	75	58	54	86	70	68	78				

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
FRL	66	58	60	78	68	63	70				

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	52	54	60	65	73	75	38				
ASN	81			86							
BLK	75	62	48	86	82	82	70				
HSP	80	61		84	68		80				
MUL	65	53		73	71						
WHT	72	61	49	88	74	70	83				
FRL	68	59	55	82	78	75	76				

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	40	39	33	49	53	54	55				
ASN	69	40		79	73						
BLK	67	69	75	86	78	78	70				
HSP	73	62		86	76						
MUL	47	33		77	80						
WHT	70	61	50	85	77	73	79				
FRL	59	58	52	76	77	74	68				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	91
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	65
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	74
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	67
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	70
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	66
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 SWD subgroup for ELA Achievement (43%) and ELA Learning Gains (42%) was the lowest-performing. This is a trend as both school grade components for this subgroup are significantly lower than the school average from the previous year as well(2018 SWD ELA Achievement 52% and ELA Learning Gains 54%). Contributing factors include consistent structure and support by VE teachers across all grade levels, as well as, the use of instructional materials that align to grade-level standards used with fidelity by all teachers that support this subgroup. For the 18-19 school year, one VE was new to the grade level and needed support with grade level content knowledge.

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

Math BQ Learning Gains for the Students with Disabilities subgroup showed the greatest decline. For one particular grade level, the ESE teacher was new to the content area in 18-19 and not familiar with grade-level standards. Additionally, scheduling and support in a three way split provided to be a contributing factor to the decline. For the year 19-20, we revised grade-level structures so that inclusion classrooms were two way splits thus improving the support provided to this subgroup. Additionally, moving a math teacher from the classroom to a VE position ensuring that this subgroup was provided support by a teacher that was an expert in the content.

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.

Our greatest gap, when compared to the state average, is in the school grade component of Science Achievement. The school had 74% of students scoring proficient in science while the state average was only 53%. 5th-grade science teachers disaggregate data weekly during common planning based on interim and progress monitoring assessments. Formative data is gathered frequently and compared to the Achievement Level Descriptors to evaluate how students are performing on the standards. Teachers use this data to drive instruction. The Achievement Level Descriptors and Item Specifications are used with fidelity when planning lessons and teachers actively partake in our district's science VLC. Furthermore, our school-based science VLC meets twice a year to ensure vertical articulation of the standards across all grade levels. Weekly science planning is a part of all

grade levels and our K-4 science instruction prepares students to successfully grapple with the 5th-grade state assessment.

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

ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains had the most improvement. In the 18-19 school year, ELA teacher began to utilize the Ready LAFS curriculum for core instruction. This curriculum supported our lowest-performing students by providing explicit instruction on grade-level standards. This growth was evident in all subgroups except Students with Disabilities. 3rd-5th grade teachers structured their ELA block to differentiate instruction and utilize gradual release with Ready LAFS lessons to pull small groups of students during work time. This provided a lower teacher to student ratio and more opportunities to remediate deficiencies with our lowest-performing student. In the year 19-20, teachers continued to utilize the Ready LAFS curriculum but began dissecting it further to ensure alignment to state standards. Through common planning focus on unpacking the standard, reviewing Item Specifications, and analyzing the Achievement Level Descriptors, teachers became more knowledgeable on how to best utilize the district curriculum and other resources to meet our students' needs.

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

TBD based on 20-21 Fall enrollment EWS data

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

1. Increase Math learning gains in BQ students with disabilities
2. Increase ELA Achievement for students with disabilities
3. Increase ELA learning gains for students with disabilities
4. Decrease percentage of students who score Level 1 in Math and ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 19-20 Standards Walkthrough observations, our teachers averaged less than 40% when observing the effectiveness of using assessments that determine mastery of grade level standards. Although the data shows teachers frequently align instructional materials and student tasks to the standards, this is not the case for assessments. In contrast, the 5 Essentials Survey data indicated that 85% of teachers feel they successfully review assessment data to make instructional decisions. If the assessment data does not fully align to grade level standards, then standards-based instruction cannot improve.
Measurable Outcome:	Three out of four (or 75%) of weekly common planning sessions will include the development of formative assessments that determine student mastery of the entire standard or appropriate grade-level component.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Formative assessments like quizzes and exit tickets drive teaching and learning. Utilizing Item Specifications and Achievement Level Descriptors to develop such assessments during weekly common planning will increase standards-based instruction and in turn increase student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As Paul Bambrick-Santoyo stated in Driven by Data, "Assessments are not the end of the teaching and learning process; they're the starting point." Planning assessments that align with grade level standards prepares students to tackle state assessments and achieve success in grade level learning targets.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborate with admin team to calibrate content area common planning agendas to increase focus on developing standards-based formative assessments.

Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

Train content area leads on facilitating common planning sessions focused on standards based assessments.

Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate weekly common planning sessions using adjusted common planning agenda.

Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

Conduct weekly classroom observations using Standards Walkthrough Tool to track the increase in the use of assessments to determine mastery of grade level standards.

Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

Review calibration data with admin team during weekly admin meeting. Debrief and determine next steps to roll out to assigned content areas/grade levels.

Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

Continue common planning sessions, standards walkthroughs, and admin meeting cycle based on determined next steps.

Person Responsible Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When students lack appropriate social skills and self-regulation, they are less likely to achieve academically. Based on our needs assessment and analysis, maintaining growth in our higher achieving students and supporting our most fragile learners (BQ and SWD) is an academic need. Focusing on improving social skills ans self-regulation with all students will thus improve students' academic performance. Discipline data from 19-20 demonstrates reveals that over 50% of discipline referrals are written for our BQ students or SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	Student referrals will decrease to less than 25% for SWD and BQ subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Calm Classroom program will be utilized school wide as a daily way to improve students social and emotional skills. This program cultivates peaceful classrooms and empowers students and educators with skills to support mental and emotional well being. Using this program in all classrooms with fidelity will improve students' ability to regulate emotions and improve social development which will improve student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"Calm Classroom provides practical mindfulness-based tools to help us manage stress and achieve emotional well-being throughout the day by activating the body's relaxation response. When we're feeling focused, relaxed and energized, we are empowered" (CalmClassroom.com). When students feel empowered behavior improves, stress decreases and student engagement decreases. Calm Classroom research notes that behavior misconduct decreased by 23% in their focus group. Additionally, 81% of teachers that use Calm Classroom reported reduced student stress and 74% of teachers reports increased student engagement.

Action Steps to Implement	
Admin team participates in Calm Classroom training and identifies school members to serve as Calm Classroom School Facilitators.	
Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
School Facilitators attend district training and prepare to serve as school based experts.	
Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
School Facilitators and admin train staff on Calm Classroom program during pre-planning week.	
Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
Teachers implement Calm Classroom strategies 2-3 times daily.	
Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)
Admin team monitors program fidelity during weekly observations and provides teacher feedback.	
Person Responsible	Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

School counselors, military counselor, and mental health counselors provide small group and 1-1 support (targeting SWD and BQ) to extend social and emotional support as needed.

Person Responsible   Crystal Lewis (lewisc@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Since three of our highest priorities are based on on SWD subgroup data, we have re-evaluated our VE teacher placements and assigned two VE teachers to support 5th grade. Our 5th grade cohort of students has the highest population of ESE students. Additionally, they are the only grade level with prior year's state assessment scores, and will contribute to all seven accountability areas for our 20-21 school grade.

Additionally, based on our school safety walk, we plan to request the following from the district:
- see-through trash cans
- remove handles from front entry double door (so door can not be chained shut)
- add reinforced mesh to all glass in doors leading outside
- trim trees away from the building
- trim bushes to 18 inches or lower
- add extra speed bump in car loop
- add cameras to oversee bike rack
- fence in all utility boxes and propane tanks
- cut vegetation off fence line to create clear line of sight around school perimeter
- add corner mirrors in hallways
- add more "No Trespassing" signs on fence lines
- tint media center windows so you can see out but not in
- change all ceilings from tiled ceilings to hard ceilings

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.

New Berlin created a positive school culture and climate by involving all stakeholders in the following ways:
- Social skills lessons with school counselors, mental health therapists, or military counselor.

- Teacher student mediation and Adult led mediation- problem-solving sessions with students to identify alternative actions and the positive or negative consequences of each alternative action.
- Classroom community building through Sanford Harmony activities and guidance lessons.
- Peer mediation- conflict resolution sessions with the student and other students that were harmed.
- Written letters of apology to those that were harmed.
- Daily encouragement of responsibility and ownership of ones actions through the guidelines for success (Bear Pledge).
- Classroom meetings and "buddy up" with targeted topics based on Foundations meetings and school needs.
- Student rewards such as positive referrals, Silver Spoons for cafeteria behavior, monthly Stupendous Student ceremonies, monthly and quarterly blended learning incentives, quarterly award ceremonies and end or year award ceremonies.
- Faculty recognition including "shout-outs" in daily recaps emails, stars celebrations, monthly Whooty awards for excellence, auction dollars and a yearly teacher auction.
- 20-21 Development and implementation of the NBE Pillars of Excellence for consistent conduct grades and school-wide behavior expectations.
- Host various school events (on and off-campus) that invite stakeholders (i.e. Movie Night on the Lawn, Polar Express Night, Family Library Night at the Highlands branch, spirit night fundraisers at local restaurants)
- Active participation from various business owners and community partners in our monthly SAC meetings

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**