Beauclerc Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Beauclerc Elementary School

4555 CRAVEN RD W, Jacksonville, FL 32257

http://www.duvalschools.org/beauclerc

Demographics

Principal: Aaron Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2018

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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

<div style="background:#2e3a6e;color:white;text-align:center;font-size:2em;padding:10px;">

Beauclerc Elementary School

</div>

4555 CRAVEN RD W, Jacksonville, FL 32257

http://www.duvalschools.org/beauclerc

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	Yes	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for successful leadership in college or a career, with an embracing understanding of diverse cultures.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide excellent educational experiences through leadership as well as through bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural dual language opportunities in every classroom, for every student, every day and in every home.

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
Walker, Aaron	Principal	Principal: Meets weekly with the Leadership Team members to ensure instructional programs and plans are implemented in a timely fashion to meet the needs of students this includes instructional delivery of the Florida State Standards in all subjects, implementation of the currently adopted district curriculum resources, implementation of the blended learning platforms, oversight and coaching updates of the Curriculum Leadership Councils in Literacy, Mathematics, Science, and Response to Intervention. Regular reviews and analysis of the school's formative and summative data, School Improvement Plan progress, and classroom monitoring data is discussed for prescriptive adjustment purposes. Furthermore, the team oversees the Safety and Security plans of the school to ensure students' safety, and plans activities for teachers and students to enhance the school's culture.The Principal also meets with the Shared Decision Making Team monthly to hear concerns and develop goals.
Riquelme, Elena	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals: Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making for classroom instruction and teacher professional development; ensures the RtI team is implementing appropriate MTSS; conducts assessment of the RtI knowledge and skills of school staff; assess teacher understanding of the Florida State Standards and assessments; monitors implementation of intervention support and proper documentation; ensure adequate professional development to support instruction of the Florida State Standards and RtI implementation and communicate with parents regarding MTSS. Responsibilities of the monitoring and implementation of the blended learning platforms are also a responsibility of the AP.
Jennings, Kim	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals: Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making for classroom instruction and teacher professional development; ensures the RtI team is implementing appropriate MTSS; conducts assessment of the RtI knowledge and skills of school staff; assess teacher understanding of the Florida State Standards and assessments; monitors implementation of intervention support and proper documentation; ensure adequate professional development to support instruction of the Florida State Standards and RtI implementation and communicate with parents regarding MTSS. Responsibilities of the monitoring and implementation of the blended learning platforms are also a responsibility of the AP.
Yadon, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	School Reading/Math Coaches: Provide quality professional development to faculty and staff relating to Florida State Standards and instructional techniques/best practices for Language Arts and Math; facilitate teacher collaboration which focuses on common lesson and assessment development; model lesson and instructional strategies for teachers and analyze data with teachers in order to make instructional decision for the classroom.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Malone, Tracey	Instructional Coach	School Reading/Math Coaches: Provide quality professional development to faculty and staff relating to Florida State Standards and instructional techniques/best practices for Language Arts and Math; facilitate teacher collaboration which focuses on common lesson and assessment development; model lesson and instructional strategies for teachers and analyze data with teachers in order to make instructional decision for the classroom.
Bonilla, Chamaira	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor: Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design, assessment and intervention with individual students; link community agencies to schools and families to support students' academic, emotional, behavioral and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents and administrators; provide group and individual interventions; assist teachers with documentation requirements and conduct direct observation of student behavior.
Howell, Rhonda	Other	Site Coach/ESE Lead Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction; monitor the fidelity of ESE services and IEP compliance and collaborates with general education teachers working with RtI and ESE students.
Howell, Patricia	Teacher, ESE	Pat Howell Site Coach/ESE Lead Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction; monitor the fidelity of ESE services and IEP compliance and collaborates with general education teachers working with RtI and ESE students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 10/1/2018, Aaron Walker

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	142	133	134	139	131	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	57	26	25	17	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	5	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	86	92	88	58	45	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	418
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	105	105	100	83	42	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	487

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	87	90	84	60	37	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	404

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/1/2020

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	126	132	132	130	124	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	25	34	32	28	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	4	8	5	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	43	82	92	96	79	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460

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	24	62	66	64	56	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	313

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	20	37	66	64	56	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284
Students retained two or more times	16	35	49	70	79	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337

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	126	132	132	130	124	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	25	34	32	28	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	4	8	5	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	43	82	92	96	79	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460

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	24	62	66	64	56	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	313

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	20	37	66	64	56	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284
Students retained two or more times	16	35	49	70	79	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	50%	57%	50%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	48%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	62%	63%	57%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	62%	50%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	34%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	48%	53%	58%	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	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					
05	2019	49%	50%	-1%	56%	-7%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison	5%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	64%	-9%	64%	-9%
	2018	57%	60%	-3%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
05	2019	64%	57%	7%	60%	4%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	16%					
Cohort Comparison	7%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	62%	49%	13%	53%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	23	47	46	31	52	40	29				
ELL	28	48	46	53	68	57	36				
ASN	60	80		73	90						
BLK	48	56	50	55	70	41	64				
HSP	47	50	45	56	55	47	67				
MUL	50	60		63	50						
WHT	63	58	50	73	73	64	73				
FRL	47	51	41	53	65	44	60				
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	17	30	28	23	29	25	21				
ELL	36	44	38	45	54	46	36				
ASN	92	80		83	70						
BLK	44	46	45	52	45	36	55				
HSP	53	47	29	51	53	40	47				
MUL	38	27		43	44						
WHT	58	53	27	70	59	17	70				
FRL	44	40	30	52	46	27	43				
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	20	46	45	21	40	32	53				
ELL	30	42	38	46	44	46	36				
ASN	64	55		93	82						
BLK	43	54	62	52	48	33	42				
HSP	42	43	44	43	37	38	38				
MUL	46	53		46	67						
WHT	61	68	41	68	53	31	87				
FRL	45	55	44	53	50	34	56				

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	60
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
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	55
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	55

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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
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	54
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.

BQ Learning Gains in ELA showed the lowest performance. Despite being the lowest area, ELA BQ did show an increase of 19 points from the prior year.
A contributing factor to the growth was targeted instruction by the ELA team with students focusing on priority standards. This additional support increased the BQ gains to only 15 points below all gains. This 15 point gap will be targeted in 20-21. We will utilize RMSE to support K-2 students in closing the BQ gap. We will utlize LLI to support the BQ students in grades 3-5.

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

There were no data components that showed a decline from the prior year, however there was no change in our ELA proficiency data. In looking for deeply at our data, we have identified 3rd grade

proficiency to be the greatest area of weakness. Our data is indicating that students coming from second grade are not as prepared to master the standards in 3rd grade. We will look to improve student readiness by using targeted research-based strategies with RMSE, LLI and teacher-led small group instruction, as well as increased support by a school based Reading Coach. In addition to the programs supporting reading and with the funds from Title 1, we intend on improving instructional technology by purchasing all in one multi-media carts.

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.

3rd grade ELA proficiency data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our 3rd grade students were 15 points below the state average. Based on our data, a significant factor to this is that our 2nd grade students are not prepared as needed for mastery of the standards in 3rd grade. We will look to improve student readiness by using targeted research-based reading strategies with RMSE and LLI and teacher-led small group instruction, as well as increased support by a school based Reading Coach. In addition to the programs supporting reading and with the funds from Title 1, we intend on improving instructional technology by purchasing all in one multi-media carts.

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

5th grade Math showed the most improvement. There was an increase of 15 and 7 points in the same cohort. A teacher change was made that strengthened the instructional rigor. Additionally, after analyzing the mid-year data, targeted groups of students were provided interventions and instructional supports to increase the lower performing quartile students as well as the proficiency and learning gains of our students. Furthermore, the school Math Coach developed lessons for students that addressed the priority standards. We will continue to use our Math Coach in planning and development of materials to support our students in the meaningful and impactful way. Finally, we will continue to implement the resources and instructional use of Acaletics to increase fluency and proficiency.

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

Attendance

Level 1

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

1. ELA: Focus on 3rd grade proficiency and BQ students
2. Math: Focus on increasing proficiency and learning gains
3. Science: Focus on increasing proficiency
4. School Climate and Culture:
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Not only is ELA our lowest academic area, it has the greatest gap between School: District and School: State in proficiency, gains and bottom quartile. While we did show an increase in 4th and 5th grade in proficiency and learning gains, there was a significant decrease in the number of proficient students in 3rd grade. As a result, our ELA data remained stagnant.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency by 10 points Increase learning gains by 5 points Increase bottom quartile learning gains by 5 points
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracey Malone (malonet1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	If teacher-led small group instruction is used with fidelity, then the needs of all learners will be met. According to the Collaborative Classroom (https://www.collaborativeclassroom.org/wp-content/uploads/nodefiles/node-presentation_smallgroupwebinarfinal.pdf), teacher-led small group instruction provides students with multiple opportunities to work at their instructional level so that their academic needs will be met. Implement RMSE in grades K-2 Implement LLI for tier 2 and 3 in grades 3-5 Focus on priority standards to increase proficiency by 10 points, learning gains by 5 points and BQ learning gains by 5 points Provide teachers with priority standards Identify BQ focus groups for small group instruction Identify current gaps Plan corrective instruction according to priority standards Monitor progress of focus groups Provide a Reading Coach through the use of Title 1 funds Provide interactive multi-media carts for grade level use purchased with Title 1 funds Through the use of Title 1 funds, the following positions will be funded: One full time Guidance Counselor 0.5 Media Specialist Through the use of Title 1 funds, the following instructional materials will be funded: Poster maker paper Storeroom materials Through the use of Title 1 funds, the following technology will be funded: Multi-Media carts Projectors Document cameras
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Although as a school, we improved in ELA gains and bottom quartile, our 3 year data has been stagnant and showing a decrease in the three accountability areas. According to our data, modifications to our instruction will be needed to show an improvement with our data in these specific areas. By implementing RMSE, LLI and teacher-led small group instruction, teachers will have the ability to provide prescriptive direct instruction that

targets the direct needs of identified students. The addition of these programs will help close the learning gaps and support the learning needs of all of our students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teachers with training with RMSE and LLI
2. Provide teachers with support with the implementation of RMSE and LLI
3. Provide coaching cycles for teachers with direct instruction
4. Analyze student data and identify students needs
5. Provide teachers and focus group leaders with materials for instruction.
6. Provide teachers with purchased document cameras, projectors and multi-media carts as needed for teachers.

Person Responsible   Tracey Malone (malonet1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While increases were made from year to year, there is a significant difference between the school and state data.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency to 67% Increase learning gains to 67% Increase BQ learning gains to 55% Target BQ students to close the gap by 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Yadon (yadone@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement Acaletics across grades 2-5 Focus on priority standards to increase proficiency to 67%, learning gains to 67% and BQ learning gains to 55% Provide teachers with priority standards Identify BQ focus groups for small group instruction Identify current gaps Plan corrective instruction according to priority standards Monitor progress of focus groups Provide a Math Coach through the use of Title 1 funds Provide interactive multi-media carts for grade level use purchased with Title 1 funds
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	BQ Focus Groups: By identifying focus student groups, we were able to pin-point our most fragile learners and provide instruction that me their specific learning needs. By providing this targeted small group instruction, we were able to improve learning gains by 19%. Acaletics: A natinally know and Florida identified program to move and improve student performance. The program is designed to support not only our fragile learners, but also our mid and upper level students. Priority Standard Focus: By strategically targeting priority standards starting in February, year over year, Math proficiency increased from 58 to 62, learning gains increased from 52 to 67 and BQ learning gains from 33 to 52. Based on our data, the targeted prescriptive instruction was successful. Through the use of Title 1 funds, the following positions will be funded: One full time Guidance Counselor 0.5 Media Specialist Through the use of Title 1 funds, the following instructional materials will be funded: Poster maker paper Storeroom materials Through the use of Title 1 funds, the following technology will be funded: Multi-Media carts Projectors Document cameras

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide training and support to teachers in the implementation of Acaletics
2. Provide teachers with the priority standards.
3. Identify 20-21 BQ students and meet with teachers.
4. Create BQ student focus groups.
5. Provide teachers and focus group leaders with materials for instruction.
6. Provide teachers with purchased document cameras, projectors and multi-media carts as needed for teachers.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Yadon (yadone@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although we made an 11 point increase from the previous year, that gain only moved Beauclerc back to where we were in the previous year. As we seek to obtain an "A", continued improvement in science will remain a focus.
Measurable Outcome:	5 point increase to 74% proficiency
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elena Riquelme (riquelmee@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	If differentiated small group instruction is used with fidelity, then the needs of all learners will be met. According to the research found in Ready, Set, SCIENCE!, when students engage in science as a practice, they develop knowledge and explanations of the natural world as they generate and interpret evidence. At the same time, they come to understand the nature and development of scientific knowledge while participating in inquiry-based learning as a social process. This evidence-based strategy will be implemented by teachers doing the following: -ensure lesson goals and objectives are clear; -analyze individual student data; -plan and deliver explicit inquiry-based instruction; -plan for differentiated instruction; -provide effective feedback; and -reflect on teaching practice. Citation: National Research Council. 2008. Ready, Set, SCIENCE!: Putting Research to Work in K-8 Science Classrooms. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11882.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that science provides a foundation for the development of language, logic, and problem-solving skills in the classroom. Students who are consistently challenged to utilize and apply scientific knowledge, language and evidence-based learning develop connections that assist them with making sense of the world. Based on our data trend and research, focused implementation of teacher-led small group instruction will increase students' scientific academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

-Provide students the opportunity for productive struggles and perseverance in reasoning and problem solving through inquiry-based learning.
-Create a student-centered environment that incorporates a variety of collaborative active learning strategies to increase student engagement.
-Utilize weekly progress monitoring tools to set goals and track student achievement.
-Conduct ongoing teacher-student data chats, teacher-admin data chats, and student-parent data chats.
-Provide teachers collaborative planning time to share research-based practices, engage in peer-to-peer coaching, reflection, and data analysis.

Person Responsible	Elena Riquelme (riquelmee@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 5 Essentials survey data, "schools that are at or above the benchmark on 3 or more of the 5 essentials are 10 times more likely to improve than schools that are below benchmark." While Beauclerc met the benchmark in all 5 areas, students' responses to a Supportive Environment increased from 46 to 54 in the neutral range. By improving and integrating data, systems and best practices to positively affect student outcomes as it relates to attendance and office disicpline referrals.
Measurable Outcome:	Our School-wide Average Daily Attendance Rate goal is to increase from 93% to 95%. Grade Specific Average Daily Attendance Rate goals are to: -Increase Kindergarten from 89% to 90% or higher -Increase 1st grade from 93% to 94% or higher -Increase 2nd grade from 93% to 94% or higher -Increase 3rd grade from 95% to 96% or higher -Increase 4th grade from 95% to 96% or higher -Increase 5th grade from 94% to 95% or higher Based on discipline referral data, 24% of students that received a referral also have an IEP compared to 7% of students without an IEP. Our school-wide goal is to provide our teachers with the necessary skills, knowledge, and best practices for ensuring our students with IEPs receive their specific behavioral accommodations to decrease our percentage by half (12%) or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chamaira Bonilla (bonillac1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to RtI for Success (https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/ MTSS%20Hot%20Topics.pdf), "For those students who may need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment, schools may choose to implement a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS), such as response to intervention (RTI) or positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS)." If a multi-tiered system of support is used throughout the school year, then student progress will be tracked and remediation and interventions will be provided to improve the achievement of all learners. Provide an additional Guidance Counselor position through the use of Title 1 funds.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing a framework through MTSS, supports will be provided to targeted students to address attendance, behavioral as well as academic issues. The rationale for providing these systems of support is to intervene early so that students may have an opportunity to catch up with their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide MTSS training to teachers
2. Provide teachers with time to analyze attendance and referral data and collaborate to remediate and provide interventions to identified students
3. Using the Collaborative Problem-Solving Team, supports will be put in place with identified groups of students with regards to attendance, behavior and course performance

3. Leadership team to meet monthly to review and discuss attendance and referral data
4. Provide teachers with strategies and systems of support for identified students through monthly grade level meetings

Person Responsible   Chamaira Bonilla (bonillac1@duvalschools.org)

#5. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 5 Essentials survey data, "schools that are at or above the benchmark on 3 or more of the 5 essentials are 10 times more likely to improve than schools that are below benchmark." While Beauclerc met the benchmark in all 5 areas, Collaborative Teachers was one of the lowest categories reported with the following scores: Collaborative Teacher Category Score: 50 (Neutral) Collaborative Practice Score: 44 (Neutral) Collaborative Responsibility Score: 25 (Weak) The Collaborative Practices and Collective Responsibility were two measures that were the lowest and both measures showed a decrease in 3 points from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Collaborative Teachers by 10 points from 50 to 60/neutral to strong Increase Collaborative Practice by 16 points from 44 to 60/neutral to strong Increase Collaborative Responsibility by 15 points from 25 to 40/weak to neutral
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Jennings (jenningsk1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the National School Climate Center, "empirical research has shown that when school members feel safe, valued, cared for, engaged, and respected, learning measurably increases, and staff satisfaction and retention are enhanced." According to Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning by John Hattie, collective teacher efficacy has the greatest impact on student achievement—even higher than factors like teacher-student relationships, home environment, or parental involvement. If utilizing the experience of our teachers and allowing teachers to self-select PD topics, run training sessions, and share their own work can lead to teachers who are active participants in their development, rather than passive receivers. This builds a culture of efficacy amongst staff who genuinely work together to improve their practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the research based on the 5 Essentials, in schools with strong collaborative teachers, all teachers collaborate to promote professional growth. Teachers are active partners in school improvement, committed to the school and are focused on professional development. In schools with strong collective responsibility, teachers share a sense of responsbility for student development, school iimprovement and professional growth. In schools with strong collaborative practices, teachers oboserve each others practice and work together to review assessment data and develop instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a Growth Mindset Team of teacher leaders who collaborate while remaining focused on the common goal of reaching a school grade of "A". This work will be with a combination of quality teacher focused professional development (see step 2) during early release training and a focus on standards based instruction in common planning.

Person Responsible	Aaron Walker (walkera@duvalschools.org)

2. Become a professional development school with training developed for teachers, by teachers. In the 20-21 school year a new team of teachers is being developed that will lead a monthly PD hour specifically designed to deliver high impact strategies to peers. This PD will take into account the unique needs of our student population and will be tailored to the skill sets of teachers.

Person Responsible	Aaron Walker (walkera@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Less than 20% of our classrooms are providing standard aligned tasks and assessments at appropriate standards demands/limits and ALD levels. According to our standards walkthrough dial data, school wide we scored a 1.6 of 5 on assessment alignment and 3.2 on task alignment, our two lowest areas. When students and teachers were asked, through the 5 Essentials survey, most reported rigor was adequate, indicating that most of our students are experiencing the negative impact of the Opportunity Myth.
Measurable Outcome:	As a school, Beauclerc will move to an average of 3.8 or higher on our standards based walkthrough dial in both task and assessment alignment by March 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Aaron Walker (walkera@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Based on the standards wakthrough tool, our team can measure our classrooms that have standards aligned in the core classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are receiving standards aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face assignments designed by the state, and the next years progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing training for teachers related to standards based instruction. Delivery will be led by school admin team in collaboration with instructional coaches and the school growth mindset team. We will utilize the data from the walkthrough tool to drive our PD delivery.

Person Responsible	Aaron Walker (walkera@duvalschools.org)

Provide a training opportunity for teachers in creating standards based assessments. This training will be led by Katie Aderholt, district specialist.

Person Responsible	Aaron Walker (walkera@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance below 90% by grade level (EWS indicator) by grade level

Level 1 on statewide assessment (EWS indicator)

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.

According to the National School Climate Center, "empirical research has shown that when school members feel safe, valued, cared for, engaged, and respected, learning measurably increases, and staff satisfaction and retention are enhanced." Positive relationships that fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students are built with parents, families and other community stakeholders throughout the year. The school will provide full opportunities for participating in parent and family engagement activities for all parents, families and community stakeholders by communicating the purpose of the event effectively. Engagement activities will be provided with flexible times, based on parent feedback obtained from the developmental meeting. The school plans to implement activities that will build the capacity with the community to improve student achievement by reflecting on input collected during the Developmental Meeting and 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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	$0.00

6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00