

Duval County Public Schools

Thomas Jefferson Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Thomas Jefferson Elementary

8233 NEVADA ST, Jacksonville, FL 32220

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

Demographics

Principal: Lori Turner A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2006

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)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (69%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Thomas Jefferson Elementary

8233 NEVADA ST, Jacksonville, FL 32220

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

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	81%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Thomas Jefferson Elementary is to educate our students in a comfortable environment that promotes high levels of achievement, builds students self-esteem and develops quality work ethics so students may reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Thomas Jefferson Elementary is a learning community committed to closing the achievement gap, celebrating diversity, and providing technological experiences to prepare our students to compete in a global society

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
Turner, Lori	Principal	The principal is responsible for educating students in a safe and healthy environment. This includes ensuring that appropriate instruction is taking place and that students and adults are physically and emotionally safe. It also involves maintaining strong relationships with stakeholders, including parents, students, faculty, staff, and community partners. The principal must ensure through observation and data analysis that instructional staff and administrators are performing at high levels. This is best determined by student learning outcomes and surveys administered to faculty, staff, parents, and students. She also serves on the Behavior Threat Assessment Team (BTAT) which meets monthly to address students who pose possible risks to themselves or the school.
Gregson, Teresa	Instructional Coach	The reading coach will attend district training and bring information back to the school to share in school-based training. She will provide support to teachers by directing common planning sessions, modeling lessons when needed, assisting with data analysis and next steps, and locating helpful instructional resources for teachers. She also serves on the Behavior Threat Assessment Team (BTAT) which meets monthly to address students who pose possible risks to themselves or the school.
Pustinger, John	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal in educating students in a safe and healthy environment. He takes the lead in student discipline. He also serves as test coordinator, Title I designee, and PBIS administrative designee. He conducts observations using a standards walk-through tool as well as informal and formal observations of teachers.
Junn, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Junn serves as a second grade teacher, grade level chair, Shared Decision chair, and Professional Development Facilitator. She is a mentor to other teachers and hosts pre-interns and interns from local colleges when asked. Mrs. Junn shares professional development opportunities with the faculty and helps them keep track of their inservice points.
Perkins, Carolyn	School Counselor	The guidance counselor is responsible for supporting students in their academic, social-emotional, and mental health needs. She monitors and facilitates meetings regarding student attendance, learning needs, interventions, and accommodations. She hosts "Wellness Wednesdays" monthly to address students' emotional wellness. She also serves on the Behavior Threat Assessment Team (BTAT) which meets monthly to address students who pose possible risks to themselves or the school.
Footman, Leslie	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Footman is the senior member of our team of three ESE teachers. She facilitates ESE team meetings to discuss scheduling and services provided to meet the needs of students with disabilities. She also facilitates meetings with parents and the district staffing team (Multidisciplinary Referral Team) when necessary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2006, Lori Turner A

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

4

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 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)	90%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (69%)
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	79	75	77	90	84	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	487
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	15	17	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	26	59	41	43	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	40	56	47	57	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	28	56	43	42	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

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	78	80	79	90	89	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	78	80	79	90	89	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	64%	50%	57%	62%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	56%	58%	63%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	50%	53%	56%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	62%	63%	76%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	63%	62%	71%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	52%	51%	58%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	48%	53%	62%	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	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
	2018	52%	50%	2%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
	2018	59%	49%	10%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	68%	50%	18%	56%	12%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	64%	16%	64%	16%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				
05	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	33	61	47	38	59	56	31				
BLK	59	73		69	76		41				
HSP	58	67		84	92						
MUL	69			75							
WHT	64	70	52	74	81	74	73				
FRL	58	70	60	64	78	70	50				
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	30	44	42	43	54	45	40				
BLK	68	89		68	59		80				
HSP	63	58		69	67						
MUL	67	60		92	80						
WHT	59	51	41	73	65	53	70				
FRL	51	56	44	63	61	45	68				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	31	42	45	52	50						
BLK	55	59		83	81		58				
HSP	42			75							
MUL	62			69							
WHT	65	66	59	75	71	44	62				
FRL	58	59	52	72	68	57	55				

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	68
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	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
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	75
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	72
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	64
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.

Reading lowest performing quartile and reading proficiency are the two lowest areas of concern. The school actually increased in both of these areas from the previous year, but will continue to concentrate on improving them and continuing the work we have already begun. Third grade proficiency has become a concern in recent years because fewer students are able to read fluently. This 2020-2021 school year will be our second year of implementing the Reading Mastery program in grades K-2. We anticipate that second grade students will end the year reading more fluently and with greater comprehension than last year. Our goal was to test the 2019-2020 outcomes after the first year of implementation, but Reading Mastery ended with the move to online school in March.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline. The cohort of students taking the science in 2019 had scored lower on the reading FSA the previous year. Generally we find that reading proficiency has a direct correlation to the science proficiency. Therefore, if we continue to work to improve our reading proficiency, then our science proficiency should increase as well. Our fifth grade students attended a field trip to Starbase this year to enhance their science experience, but we were unable to measure its impact on their standards mastery (without the standardized state test). We need to ensure that we are utilizing resources provided by the district to increase science proficiency. Making use of the Penda computer-based program, increasing participation in the Science Fair, and attending science field trips such as Starbase should contribute to greater proficiency.

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.

All of our components were higher than the state average, but some were higher than others. There was a 20% positive gap in our math lowest performing quartile learning gains. The state average was 51% and the school average was 71%. This is directly related to the teachers' increase in small group instruction and timely feedback on assessments/assignments. If we continue to utilize the strategies that were implemented, we should continue to see improvements in those areas. The one curricular addition we were unable to measure this year is Acaletics. Student growth in Acaletics was measured monthly by scrimmages and celebrated monthly with Green Parties. While we plan to continue implementation, we did not have a state standardized test to measure its effectiveness.

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

The most improvement was shown in the math lowest 25th percentile learning gains. There was a 22% increase in this area, from 49% in 2018 to 71% in 2019. This is directly related to the teachers' increase in small group instruction and timely feedback on assessments/assignments. If we continue to utilize the strategies that were implemented last year we should continue to see improvement in those areas.

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

The percent of students with reading testing deficiencies was 34.2 and the percent of students with math testing deficiencies was 29.4. We found these to be areas of concern.

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

1. Reading and Math FSA Proficiency
2. Reading and Math FSA LPQ Gains
3. Family and Community Engagement
4. Science Proficiency
5. S.T.E.A.M.-related Experiences for Students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>If students in grades K-5 receive core instruction on specific components of the standards and are monitored for comprehension by frequent formative assessment, then their reading and math proficiency will increase.</p> <p>Our primary areas of focus are reading and math FSA proficiency. We plan to increase our proficiency by first unpacking the Florida standards more thoroughly. We will tailor core instruction to address specific components of the standards that students need to master. Use of formative assessment to check comprehension frequently will help teachers monitor students' progress toward proficiency. A classroom teacher funded by Title I will collaborate with colleagues during common planning sessions, conduct data analysis, and share instructional knowledge. The teachers will engage in the practice of unpacking standards for use in instruction.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>In line with the state's measure that 62% of school grade points equate to an "A", our goal is to achieve at least 62% in all proficiency and learning gains categories. In categories in which we already achieved 62%, our goal is to increase by at least two percentage points.</p> <p>2019 ELA Grade 3 - 56%; 2021 Goal - 62% 2019 ELA Grade 4 - 66%; 2021 Goal - 68% 2019 ELA Grade 5 - 68%; 2021 Goal - 70%</p> <p>2019 Math Grade 3 - 62%; 2021 Goal - 64% 2019 Math Grade 4 - 80%; 2021 Goal - 82% 2019 Math Grade 5 - 81%; 2021 Goal - 83%</p> <p>2019 Science Grade 5 - 63%; 2021 Goal - 65%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Teachers All (all_tj_teachers@duvalschools.org)</p> <p>A Reading Coach position will be used to monitor and assess reading achievement, providing support through professional development and standards-based coaching for teachers. Professional development may include opportunities to travel to Florida Title I conferences or workshops to learn effective strategies for instruction, collaboration, and student/family engagement.</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Math teachers will utilize the Ready MAFS and Acaletics program to increase student understanding and mastery of tested math standards.</p> <p>Teachers and paraprofessionals will utilize district, state, and teacher-created resources to support standards-based reading and math instruction and to design centers that address specific deficiencies for students performing below grade level.</p> <p>Administrators and the Reading Coach will visit classrooms to observe whether reading and math instruction, materials, and student tasks are aligned to standards.</p> <p>The Title I parent liaison (if funded) will support academic proficiency by helping parents understand how to assist their children with academic instruction at home.</p>

The Reading Coach, teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators are critical to successful implementation of standards-based instruction.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

The Reading Coach will provide teachers professional development and coaching on new materials. Our school implemented the Reading Mastery program in grades K-2 for the first time this past 2019-2020 school year. The Reading Coach will continue to keep the teachers informed of training opportunities and help monitor student progress and record data. Other professional development may include sending representatives to the Exceeding Expectations conference in Orlando.

Ready MAFS is being used based on prior success. Acaletics is provided by the district.

The Reading Interventionist will provide intensive instruction for grades 3-5 using LLI materials.

Teachers will monitor student progress by reviewing data independently, with grade level colleagues, and with the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, and Reading Interventionist. Data to be reviewed will include student work, assessments, and select supplemental programs such as LLI.

Action Steps to Implement

During common planning, analyze the standards that will be addressed during core instruction.

Design or use already prepared formative assessment to frequently check student comprehension of the standards.

Monitor to ensure that instruction, materials, and student tasks are aligned to standards.

Provide center instruction using district and state resources such as the i-Ready Profile Detail Report, i-Ready Teacher Toolbox, i-Ready Tools for Instruction, FCRR activities, Eureka Math activities, Acaletics Math activities, and Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI).

Fidelity will be measured by classroom walk-throughs by administration, common planning led by the Reading Coach, Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention logs, and discussions in Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible Teachers All (all_tj_teachers@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

If we diagnose and remediate reading and math deficiencies for our lowest performing 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students, then our lowest performing quartile learning gains will increase.

Our secondary area of focus is increasing the learning gains of the lowest performing quartile of students in reading and math. We plan to accomplish this by implementing more frequent and targeted small group instruction to remediate students' skills. A reading interventionist will work with an assigned group of lower-performing students in grades 3-5 to help strengthen their reading skills. A full-time paraprofessional and a part-time paraprofessional will work with students as needed in grades K-5 to help strengthen their reading and math skills.

Based on the scale for achieving school grades, we must earn at least 62% of the points to achieve a letter grade of "A". Therefore, we are aiming to earn at least 62% in each category. In categories that already exceeded 62%, we are aiming to increase by 2 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

2019 Reading Learning Gains - 69%; 2021 Goal - 71%
 2019 Math Learning Gains - 80%; 2021 Goal - 82%
 2019 Reading Lowest Performing Quartile Learning Gains - 55%; 2021 Goal - 62%
 2019 Math Lowest Performing Quartile Learning Gains - 71%; 2021 Goal - 73%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teachers All (all_tj_teachers@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

A Reading Interventionist position will be used to remediate the lowest performing quartile students, primarily using the Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) program. Reading teachers will use district, state, and teacher-created resources to design centers that address deficiencies in the lowest performing quartile of students.

Math teachers will utilize the Ready MAFS supplemental materials and the Acaletics math program to increase student understanding and mastery of tested math skills. Math teachers will use district, state, and teacher-created resources to design centers that address deficiencies in the lowest performing quartile of students.

Reading and math teachers will use center-based small group instruction to remediate students' specific instructional deficiencies.

A full-time paraprofessional and a part-time professional will be used to assist with small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The Reading Interventionist will provide intensive instruction for grades 3-5 using LLI materials.

Ready MAFS materials are being used based on prior success. Acaletics Math is provided by the district.

It is important that teachers monitor student progress by meeting with small center groups

regularly and reviewing student data frequently. Data will be shared among grade level colleagues and with the administrators and Reading Interventionist.

Action Steps to Implement

During common planning, collaborate on activities to be used during center instruction.

Provide Reading center instruction using district and state resources such as the i-Ready Profile Detail Report, i-Ready Teacher Toolbox, i-Ready Tools for Instruction, FCRR activities, and Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) with the Reading Interventionist. Utilize a Title I part-time paraprofessional to assist with small group instruction.

Provide Math center instruction using district and state resources such as the i-Ready Profile Detail Report, i-Ready Teacher Toolbox, i-Ready Tools for Instruction, Eureka Math activities, and Acaletics Math activities. Utilize a Title I part-time paraprofessional to assist with small group instruction.

Offer extra credit Multiple Intelligences opportunities to allow students to demonstrate mastery of standards in alternative ways.

Fidelity will be measured by classroom walk-throughs by administration, common planning led by the Reading Coach and administration, Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention logs, and discussions in Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible Teachers All (all_tj_teachers@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our area of focus is successful common planning that aligns instruction and tasks to the standard. This will enhance the quality of our standards-based instruction. Common planning last school year focused on standards analysis more in grades 3-5 than in K-2. This year our goal is to align standards to tasks in the primary grades as well.
Measurable Outcome:	80% of all core teachers will engage in successful common planning that aligns instruction and tasks to the standard, increasing our Standards Walk-through dial by 50% in the area of instructional delivery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Turner (turnerl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will design common planning sessions that focus on standards alignment to tasks in all grade levels. The effectiveness will be monitored by standards walk-throughs that consistently include first and second grade classrooms. The evidence will be the ratings on the Standards Walk-through Tool in the area of Instructional Delivery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing common planning more effectively would improve our implementation of standards-aligned instruction as a group. The Standards Walk-through Tool was used last year primarily to monitor standards-aligned instruction in grades 3-5. This year it will be used school-wide as evidence that students in the lower grades (who do not take the state assessment) are receiving instruction that aligns to standards as well. This will help prepare first and second grade students for their transition to grades that take the state assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

The Leadership Team consisting of the principal, assistant principal, and reading coach will designate two hours weekly to analyze standards to be taught for the next three weeks.

The Leadership Team will create a norms document that identifies discussion of standards as the primary focus of common planning.

The Leadership Team will prepare common planning agendas for the week based on the analyzed standards and follow the agendas during common planning.

The common planning facilitator will complete the Learning Arc Creation Document (provided by the district) during common planning.

The Leadership Team will engage in 5 or 7 walk-throughs weekly using the Standards Walk-through Tool. The principal and assistant principal will visit the same classes separately and then calibrate observation results.

The Leadership Team will discuss walk-through results at their weekly meeting and plan next steps for improvement.

Person Responsible Lori Turner (turnerl@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our primary area of focus is increasing reading and math proficiency on the FSA. We plan to achieve this by first unpacking the Florida standards more thoroughly. Student learning will focus on specific components of the standards. The use of formative assessment to frequently check for comprehension will help monitor students' progress toward proficiency.

Our secondary area of focus is increasing the learning gains of the lowest performing quartile of students in reading and math. We plan to accomplish this by implementing more frequent and targeted small group instruction to remediate students' skills.

Safety is an important focus of the school. According to the UChicago 5 Essentials Survey, our students' perception of safety is our weakest area. Of the fourth and fifth graders surveyed, only 24% felt safe in the outside area of the school, and only 26% felt safe in the bathrooms. We will address these concerns by first having conversations with the students to ascertain why they are fearful in these areas. As a faculty, we will brainstorm solutions to their concerns. We will continue to have safety drills each month to prepare them for emergency situations. We will address students' social emotional health through activities such as Wellness Wednesdays, the Calm Classroom program, and monthly character ("Careacter") education. The Behavioral Threat Assessment Team (BTAT) will meet monthly to discuss students who potentially cause risk to others and/or themselves. Our goal is to deliberately instill a sense of safety and well-being in our students.

Another school-wide area of focus is increasing our family and community engagement through use of a parent liaison (if funded) and our parent resource center. The parent liaison and parent resource center are provided to support parents and families in their efforts to help their children academically at home. The focus on community engagement includes increasing the number of Business/Faith-based partnerships with the school to enhance the community involvement within the school. One strategy for increasing our partnerships is by having each grade level work as a team to find a community business or faith-based organization to enter into a partnership agreement with the school. This will benefit both the school and the organizations through a joint effort to support student growth and learning. These partnerships will help provide outside support for faculty, staff, and students through the use of incentives provided by the partners as well as increased involvement of the partners in school functions and activities.

A additional focus is increasing the Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics (S.T.E.A.M.) opportunities for students through field trips, assemblies, guest speakers, guest performances, after school clubs, and materials necessary for the experiences. Specific S.T.E.A.M. opportunities include:

MOSH Field Trip for Grade 4

Starbase Field Trip for Grade 5

Zoo Field Trips for Grades K, 1, 2, 3, and 5

The following incentives will be offered during the year for achieving reading and math goals:

Reading Celebration

Acaletics Green Party

PBIS Store Rewards (also given for behavior)

Game Trucks

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.

The school provides various Title I and non-Title I family activities in order to build positive relationships with all stakeholders. Utilizing the parent liaison (if funded) and an active PTA, the school increases the level of communication and parent understanding of school life, creating an environment conducive to higher achievement. Some of our events include family nights, festivals, academic competitions, student recognitions, parent and grandparent recognitions, volunteer orientations, parent resource center tours, and celebrations of service. We also publicly acknowledge faith-based, business, and community partners who contribute to the academic, physical, and social-emotional well-being of our students.

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				\$59,850.90
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0481 - Thomas Jefferson Elementary	Title, I Part A	486.0	\$59,850.90
<i>Notes: Classroom Teacher</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$99,731.24
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0481 - Thomas Jefferson Elementary	Title, I Part A	486.0	\$68,292.67
<i>Notes: Reading Interventionist</i>						
	5100	150-Aides	0481 - Thomas Jefferson Elementary	Title, I Part A	486.0	\$24,889.91
<i>Notes: Classroom Paraprofessional</i>						
	5100	150-Aides	0481 - Thomas Jefferson Elementary	Title, I Part A	486.0	\$6,548.66
<i>Notes: Part-time Paraprofessional</i>						

			0481 - Thomas Jefferson Elementary			\$0.00
			0481 - Thomas Jefferson Elementary			\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
Total:						\$159,587.99