Englewood Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Englewood Elementary School

4359 SPRING PARK RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/englewood

Demographics

Principal: Hope Teper

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Englewood Elementary School

4359 SPRING PARK RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/englewood

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	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our Mission Statement:
Englewood Elementary provides students with the proper tools, skills, and experiences that support academic achievement and create opportunities for participation in a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision Statement:
Our students will be prepared academically, socially, and emotionally for the expectations of middle school and be productive participants in their communities and beyond.

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
Reis, Luisa	Principal	
Reshard, Charanda	School Counselor	
Richardson, Kate	Teacher, K-12	Reading Interventionist
Domingo, Angela	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Hope Teper

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.*
1

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

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)	94%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	84	75	99	110	85	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	43	26	28	39	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	0	8	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	1	8	7	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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
Monday 6/8/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	50%	57%	52%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	62%	63%	70%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	63%	62%	67%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	53%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	48%	53%	52%	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	32%	51%	-19%	58%	-26%	
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	57%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%	
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	56%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		-3%					
05	2019	32%	50%	-18%	56%	-24%	
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		-12%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%	
	2018	66%	59%	7%	62%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-13%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	61%	64%	-3%	64%	-3%	
	2018	63%	60%	3%	62%	1%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison		-5%					
05	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%	
	2018	69%	61%	8%	61%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		-25%					
Cohort Comparison		-19%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	31%	49%	-18%	53%	-22%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison	-18%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	41	57	31	52	47	17				
ELL	27	42	42	55	65	48	36				
ASN	43	35		90	89		50				
BLK	38	60		50	41		25				
HSP	28	48	45	53	61	48	50				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	54	56		67	58		36				
FRL	36	54	67	59	61	50	40				
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	13	20	15	35	67	50					
ELL	31	43	36	68	68	44	29				
ASN	67	67		86	80						
BLK	43	56	50	70	73	54	72				
HSP	34	35	18	68	65	43	41				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	52	38		77	86		45				
FRL	44	46	38	73	73	52	55				
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	33	32	30	33	55	46					
ELL	27	50	60	67	68	62	60				
ASN	45	55		80	91						
BLK	49	63	39	59	53	44	31				
HSP	46	56	70	73	71	70	73				
WHT	63	61		76	76		58				
FRL	49	56	52	66	60	50	47				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	60
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	43
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	49

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	75
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	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA Achievement declined from 45% to 39%. Our ELL population has increased dramatically and is now at 49%. Additional contributing factors would be SWD (17%) and ELL (27%) subgroups. A contributing factor is an increasing ELL and SWD population. The SWD had a 4 points increase and ELL had a 4 point decrease. Having strategic and consistent small group instruction has been a challenge.

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

Math Achievement declined from 73% to 61%. The lowest 25th percentile scored only 46%. The lowest quartile mostly made up of ELL and SWD who need additional time to develop math concepts and who need strategic instruction to close the gap.

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.

The biggest gap was in Reading: -26% (3rd grade), -23% (4th), -24% (5th). Students were making gains, but couldn't reach proficiency level. The gap between gains was only -8% and we were 3 point above the state in the LPG group which was a focus for the 18-19 school year. ELL students also had language barriers to overcome to perform at the proficient level.

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

Our ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement. They scored 3% above the state average and 6% above the district average. In 2018-2019 actions included increase progress monitoring, aligned student help with the reading interventionist. In addition, we utilized Phonics for Reading and ACT materials for SWD and ELL subgroups. In 19-20, Reading Mastery was added to all K-2 students and Corrective Reading to 3-5th who met district criteria. Differentiated small group instruction was provided for 3-5th students not prescribed Corrective. They utilized materials such as Phonics For Reading, LLI and ACT.

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

An area of concern is attendance. Out of our 500 + enrolled students, 203 of them had an attendance below the 90% threshold. Our students need to be present to participate both in our grade appropriate core instruction and in our targeted interventions. We will continue to address attendance through our parent and family involvement and reach programs.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Math Achievement
3. Science Achievement
4. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
5. Family & Community Involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a strong correlation between reading proficiency and academic success in all areas. Although students were making gains, they were not closing the gap and scoring in the proficient range. Student gains were 52% in ELA; however, our achievement level decreased by 6%. This provides evidence that our in-class tasks and assessments were not aligned to standards in order to drive instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the evidence that in-class tasks and assessments are aligned. As evidenced by our Standards-Walkthrough Form data collection, we will increase "Guides Teaching" from 1.5 to 1.8 and "Guides Learning" from 0.6 to 1.2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our Reading Coach will lead the work on planning and support for teachers to align standard-based instruction (tasks and assessments) (tier 1) with an effective research-based curriculum to differentiate and meet individual needs in daily small groups. Our Reading Interventionist will work closely with our Instructional Team do determine which students will receive support. Through targeted small group instruction the reading interventionist will support those students who need to bridge their gap to achieve grade-level proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction will allow teachers to formatively assess students' progress toward standard mastery. Daily differentiated small group instruction with effective researched-based programs will meet students on their level and help close the achievement gap. Using last year's (19-20) Standards Walkthrough Form, it was determined that standards do not closely guide teaching and mostly do not guide student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan and implement units/lessons that are standards-based and aligned assessment for standard based unit/lesson through guidance and support from our Coach.
2. Differentiated small group instruction focusing on the 5 components of reading on a daily basis. These groups will be flexible based on progress monitoring data.
3. Utilize DI programs will fidelity and accurate progress monitoring data will be collected as prescribed by the program. Leadership will monitor DI progress monitoring data on a monthly basis.
4. Engage in frequent data chats with students.
5. Meaningful data-driven common planning sessions which include planning for small group instruction.
6. Leadership will engage in 1:1 data chats at the end of each grading period.
7. Reading interventionist will provide targeted small group instruction for tier-3 students.
8. Paraprofessionals will be used in the classroom setting to provide DI using Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading programs to support student achievement.

Person Responsible	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Achievement scores have declined from 73% (2018) to 61% (2019). In addition, we showed a decrease in the learning gains as well with our lowest 25th percentile.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math proficiency to score at least 65% in Math Achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	2nd - 5th: Continue to implement Athletics with flexible differentiated small groups. K-1: Increase standards based instruction with hands on learning and small group instruction. K-5: Align assessments (mastery checks) to standards based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Acaletics has been proven successful in our Duval school's who piloted the program as well as schools in south Florida with large ELL populations. Students continue to struggle with basic Math skills and we would like to strengthen the foundation in K-1.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Acaletics training and continuous professional development throughout the year.(2-5)
2. Monthly progress monitoring of Acaletics to facilitate flexible groupings and individual data chats.
3. School based professional development for hands on and small group instruction. (K-1)
4. Use of gradual release model to ensure more frequent progress monitoring of standards. (i.e mastery checks, exit tickets)
5. Use Read, Draw, Write method at least once daily during core math lessons.

Person Responsible	Kim Hayward (haywardk@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science achievement score declined from 55% to 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	Science achievement will be equal to or above the district average for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Hayward (haywardk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase standards based instruction with embedded with hands on experiences, technology and cross curricular instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the decline in Science scores, we want to increase time designated in the schedule for strategic instructional groups as well as embed Science instruction in other content area which will result in increased achievement levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Targeted Science instruction with integration of Science technology, prescribed small groups and intervention.
2. K-5 will have a 45 min. Science block built into the weekly resource schedule.
3. Resource teachers will embed a review of previous year's Science standards in their 3-5 block when applicable. (5th grade will review 4th grade Science standards).
4. School wide Science focus calendar will be created to allow for science to be embedded in other content areas. (Example: Reading small group can use a non-fiction book based on the Science topic.)
5. Incorporate Science discussions into weekly PLC for 3rd-5th grade and monthly in K-2.

Person Responsible	Kim Hayward (haywardk@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Englewood has had a steady decline with family and community involvement. Title I nights average 20 participants. With 50% of the student populating being ESOL there are multiple communication barriers.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase monthly Title I nights' average attendance to at least 50 participants.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Domingo (sdomingo@jacksonvilleclassical.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase family and community involvement through more frequent communication, meaningful Title I events, and grade level communication.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased family and community involvement directly correlates with increased student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase use of digital communication (i.e. S'more, Microsoft Teams)
2. Provide a minimum of 10 days notice of all events at the school in various languages.
3. Provide a monthly calendar of events to families and stakeholders via multiple outlets (i.e. Newsletter, Social Media, Website)
4. Provide incentives at monthly Title I events to increase family participation
5. Designate staff to model and explain resources in the Parent Resource Center for each Title 1 event.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have been able to identify through the use of our SBI walkthroughs and the tools we use to record and report our findings that there is a strong deficiency in both our observations of Student Task Alignment (0.5/2) and all areas of Assessing Student Learning (2.3/5).
Measurable Outcome:	Walkthrough dashboard report will show an increase from .05 to 1.2, that teachers are using standards-aligned tasks in their lessons. We will also be able to observe an increase in all Areas of Student Learning, including Determining Mastery, Learning Arc Alignment and FSA Alignment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will address each of the identified areas of need during our weekly scheduled common planning sessions. A focus for our planning will be Planning using the learning arc. Staff will receive a weekly report of the Dashboard Dials to understand our Focus for the week. Due to the new leadership team present in the school, calibration will be done each quarter to ensure our look fors are aligned. Use classroom models to showcase SBI to peers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs will be used to expose teachers to the learning arc and to a deeper understanding of each standard. Common Planning will be used to help teachers align tasks and assessments. The weekly report of the Dashboard Dials will serve as a school-wide monitor for our next focus. Calibration will be needed since we are a new leadership team. Peer modeling will be selected and used when it will work to support teachers in planning and delivering aligned instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Extensive work with the learning arcs.
Support from the reading and math coach on aligned tasks and assessments.
Peer modeling for exemplary SBI
Common planning focused on the needs reported by our Walkthrough dials

Person Responsible	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As identified in the 5 Essentials report, teachers do not feel as the collaborative practices in school are well aligned with our mission and vision. Also, teachers report that our school lacks school-wide plans to effectively implement PBIS.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to reduce our Level 1 referrals by 50% by outlining school-wide practices to deal with classroom handled behavior vs. office handled behavior. By implementing a Level 1 incident sheet with consistent school-home communication we will reduce our documented level 1 incidents. By implementing calm classrooms, PBIS strategies, Wellness-Wednesdays, and consistent school-wide discipline plans we plan to reduce our level 2&3 infractions by 30%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Domingo (sdomingo@jacksonvilleclassical.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Working with our PBIS team to create a plan which will enable our staff to easily identify the behavior that is occurring and how to address it.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school discipline data and 5 essential reports both indicate the need for this implementation. The lack of steps to follow in the past year has resulted in the over referral and underutilization of positive incentives for students.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership will continue to closely monitor our progress of data (academic, culture & discipline) to revisit our needs and reassess our strategies.

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.

Englewood will continue to develop a positive school culture and environment by increasing communication among all stakeholders. Communication will be through hard copies, phone calls, texts and digital newsletters as well as utilizing our website and social media platforms. Hard copies will be translated into Spanish, Arabic, Burmese and Albanian. Digital versions (such as a newsletter created on Smore) can also be linked to google translate and can be translated in any written language. Based on our Title 1 developmental meeting and parent input, we will also begin utilizing technology to increase participation in conferences, meetings and Title 1 events.
In addition, we will continue to invite Stakeholders to these events and utilize the evaluation/feedback forms completed after the events. In addition, surveys will be conducted a few times a year to continuously ensure we are doing everything possible to build a positive culture with all stakeholders involved.

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: Parent Involvement	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00