

Duval County Public Schools

Neptune Beach Elementary School



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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Neptune Beach Elementary School

1515 FLORIDA BLVD, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

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

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Kavanagh

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
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: A (73%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Neptune Beach Elementary School

1515 FLORIDA BLVD, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	55%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We fully commit ourselves to every child's individual pathway to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will know how to apply the skills they learn to their life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kavanagh, Elizabeth	Principal	<p>The school-based Leadership Team will meet weekly. The meetings will be designed to review data and to help with plans and instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The aforementioned team (or select members thereof) will review all Tier 2/3, Overage & One Plus year retained students. Formative and summative diagnostic material will be reviewed to determine areas of focus and to develop prescriptive measures. Evaluation will then occur and the cycle will repeat or expand as needed. Any student referred to Multi-Tiered Support Systems (MTSS) for consideration of Exceptional Student Education (ESE) will be reviewed by the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) leadership team for supporting documentation.</p>
Baxter, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Forte, Brooke	School Counselor	<p>The school-based Leadership Team will meet weekly. The meetings will be designed to review screening data and to help with plans and instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The aforementioned team (or select members thereof) will review all Tier 2/3, Overage & One Plus year retained students. Formative and summative diagnostic material will be reviewed to determine areas of focus and to develop prescriptive measures. Evaluation will then occur and the cycle will repeat or expand as needed. Any student referred to MRT for consideration of ESE will be reviewed by the RtI leadership team for supporting documentation.</p>
Darcy, Marylou	Teacher, ESE	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Almon, Marla	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2020, Elizabeth Kavanagh

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.*

7

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
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: A (73%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (74%)

	2015-16: A (65%)
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	146	142	112	121	151	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	8	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	3	6	1	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	7	8	16	41	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	4	3	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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

Thursday 6/11/2020

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	141	143	111	124	139	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	824
Attendance below 90 percent	25	29	23	21	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	2	6	3	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	19	36	42	42	46	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218

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	1	8	10	27	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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		7	3	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	141	143	111	124	139	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	824
Attendance below 90 percent	25	29	23	21	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	2	6	3	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	19	36	42	42	46	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218

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	1	8	10	27	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	7	3	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	77%	50%	57%	76%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	67%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	50%	53%	48%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	62%	63%	87%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	85%	63%	62%	88%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%	52%	51%	74%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	78%	48%	53%	81%	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	78%	51%	27%	58%	20%
	2018	80%	50%	30%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	52%	22%	58%	16%
	2018	68%	49%	19%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	77%	50%	27%	56%	21%
	2018	73%	51%	22%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	61%	23%	62%	22%
	2018	83%	59%	24%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
	2018	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	91%	57%	34%	60%	31%
	2018	87%	61%	26%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	49%	28%	53%	24%
	2018	81%	56%	25%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	48	52	39	68	81	74	46				
ELL	50	60		75	80						
BLK	47	48	24	70	73	71	31				
HSP	71	74	82	80	85		77				
MUL	73	63		83	78						
WHT	84	67	48	90	88	74	86				
FRL	63	60	38	77	76	65	68				
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	51	47	42	65	56	39	73				

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
ELL	50			70							
ASN	80			100							
BLK	43	46	35	61	63	50	50				
HSP	73	66		79	69		88				
MUL	86	62		100	100						
WHT	79	63	43	86	83	64	84				
FRL	62	56	46	76	78	66	70				
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	38	48	38	65	78	71	20				
ELL	43	40		79	100						
BLK	49	63	53	75	81	67	59				
HSP	66	50	20	82	81	91	64				
MUL	80	77		88	100						
WHT	83	71	58	91	90	72	88				
FRL	62	60	43	79	83	70	69				

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	70
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	63
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	
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	52
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	78
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	74
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	77
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.

The area of with the lowest performance was ELA lowest 25% gains. The ELA bottom quartile data was at 45%. For the past three years ELA bottom quartile data points has been the lowest performing area within the school.

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

Science proficiency declined by 3% from the previous year. In 2017-18, 81% of the 5th grade students were proficient compared to 78% in 2018-19.

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 greatest gap compared to the state was the lower performing students in ELA. 45% of the lower performing students made gains compared to the state average of 53%.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was the math lower performing student gains. The gains went from 61% for the 2017-18 year to 74% in 2018-19.

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

The one area of concern from the EWS data, student attendance.

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

1. Make clear leadership expectations for meeting instructional goals.
2. Implement and monitor what's learned during professional development.
3. Communicate clearly with teachers, staff, and community stakeholders the vision for our school.
4. ELA Lower Performing Student Gains and proficiency.
5. Student Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Highly effective professional development impacts student learning through administrative support, monitoring of implementation of the professional development, and giving timely and valuable feedback to each teacher. Using data collected from the 5Essential survey and Standard Walkthrough data, the areas in professional learning that needed improvement were; providing timely feedback to teachers after going into their classroom, monitoring the implementation of professional development that was just taught, assessing student learning, and providing support for the teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of our core teachers will meet the objectives from 5Essential survey and the Standard Walkthrough data by engaging in collaborative designed professional development and instructional planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Comparing the 5Essential survey data from the 2018-19 to 2019-20, 49% of the staff determined these areas needing improvement; providing timely feedback to teachers after going into their classroom, monitoring the implementation of professional development that was just taught, and providing support for teachers. Data collected during classroom walkthroughs indicated that 68% of student assessments did not meet the given standard or item specification that would provide students the opportunity to show mastery of the standard they were working on.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing and designing highly effective professional development with the assistance of teachers. After implementing the professional development training, leadership will fully support, monitor, and give valuable feedback allowing for teacher and student growth. Neptune Beach Elementary will ensure that student assessment experience is equivalent to state standards. This may include, but is not limited to, item specifications, appropriate item types, assessment limits, along with students progressing yearly with the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Record model classroom teachers and during common planning have teachers watch the video to enhance the standard based model in each classroom.
2. Teachers meet bi-weekly with leadership team to discuss and implement professional development ideas through the collection of data.
3. Classroom walkthroughs with explicit and timely feedback to promote and drive the ongoing classroom instruction.
4. PLC's with each K-5 team to design and match assessments with given standard and item specifications to ensure students are working towards mastering a given standard.
5. During the first four weeks of school the administrative team will conduct classroom walkthroughs and calibrate together using the Standard Walkthrough Tool.
6. Administration will meet regularly to discuss findings from classroom walkthroughs and have rich conversations to develop next steps.

Person Responsible Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)

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

The overall level of ELA Lower Performing Gains is currently at 45%. The school has demonstrated a decrease of 3% since 2016.

Measurable Outcome:

The goal is to increase the ELA Lower Performing Gains to more closely align with the lower performing gains in mathematics of 74%. This will require a gain of approximately 28% overall for students in 3-5 grade.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Kavanagh (kavanaghe@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Through design, rigor, and implementation of professional development to engage and improve teacher knowledge throughout the school year in the areas of lower performing students, writing, and disaggregating data (pre-planning, common planning, after school training's) will lead to increasing lower performing student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The overall level of ELA Lower Performing Gains is currently at 45%. The school has demonstrated a decrease of 3% since 2016. Teachers lack remediation tools and disaggregation of data to determine who the lower performing students are and how to implement classroom strategies and tools to increase student achievement/gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers visit model classrooms to enhance implementation of differentiated instruction with lower performing students.
2. Teachers meet bi-weekly with leadership team to discuss explicit points to improve student achievement.
3. Implement professional development for LLI, Achieve 3000, i-Ready, and Top Score to assist with successfully incorporating these resources within the classroom.
4. Utilize tutors/mentors and materials to provide support and instruction for identified students. (If allowed)
5. Classroom walkthroughs with explicit and timely feedback to promote and drive the ongoing classroom instruction to improve student gains.
6. Re-aligned teachers within the intermediate grade levels to improve our overall literacy proficiency.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Kavanagh (kavanaghe@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Student attendance will be monitored weekly by the school leadership team to determine students with excessive absences. Strategies, such as monthly incentives for good attendance, parent contact, and interventions from the school social worker allowing for improvement in school wide student attendance.

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 works closely with our Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Volunteer Coordinator and external community to recruit volunteers and Business Partners. Our goal is to increase the number of parents participating in at least one parent education event that includes Open House, Volunteer and Business Partner Orientation, Literacy Night, Math Night, Science Night, SAC, and PTA. The Administrative Team sends out a weekly update with news, praise, and upcoming events. The school's mission and vision are shared during Open House, as well as during our Volunteer/Business Partner Orientation, and our school website. Teachers are expected to utilize the District Progress Report schedule to inform parents of student progress. Many teachers use Shutterfly, Class Dojo, and other instructional technologies to communicate with their parents.

Neptune Beach prides itself with many different stakeholders that address building a positive culture and environment:

- Well attended School Advisory Council comprised of teachers, community members, and parents that assists with building a positive environment and supporting rigorous academics at Neptune Beach Elementary.
- Programs such as Safety Patrols, Teachers of Tomorrow (TOTS), Girls on the Run, and Manatee Milers, which encourages positive behavior and high academic standards, that students strive to meet.
- Neptune Beach has a strong Positive Behavior Intervention Team (PBIS) that works hard to improve the culture and environment of Neptune Beach. The school is in the process of applying to become a model school within the district. This emphasizes and models a positive school culture where other schools within the district emulate strategies used by Neptune Beach that promotes a positive school environment. Strategies are implemented within this program, such as improving school-wide positive referrals for students that match Neptune Beach's Manatee Mission.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

Total:		\$0.00
--------	--	--------