Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

http://www.duvalschools.org/tlam

Demographics

Principal: Aurelia Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	72%
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* Native American Students* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

http://www.duvalschools.org/tlam

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide every student, in every classroom, every day with a safe, caring, engaging and challenging learning environment that promotes the rigorous and relevant educational experiences necessary to perform at or above grade level standards.

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
Williams, Aurelia	Principal	Facilitate the leadership team meetings where we will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Shaw, Sharonette	Assistant Principal	As the Math Instructional Lead and AP of Student Services, AP Shaw will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Bean-Pinkney, Jo-den	Teacher, K-12	As the ELA teacher and part time Interventionist, Mrs. Bean will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Bryan, Molly	Teacher, ESE	As the FRVE, Ms. Bryan will review academic and behavior Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 2 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Carter, Anoda	Teacher, Career/ Technical	As the CTE teacher and Electives Department Chair, Ms. Carter will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Curry, Sequan	School Counselor	As the School Counselor, Mr. Curry will review academic and behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Madison, Felecia	Teacher, K-12	As the Social Studies Department Chair, Mrs. Madison will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Jones, David	Teacher, K-12	As the Science Department Chair, Mr. Jones will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Ronek, Naomi	Assistant Principal	As the Science and Social Studies Instructional Lead and AP of Student Services, AP Shaw will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Van De Guchte, Margaret	Other	As the Gifted Lead Teacher, Ms. Van De Guchte will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all gifted students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all gifted students for postsecondary education.
Bolden, Myra	Teacher, K-12	As the Math Department Chair, Ms. Bolden will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Brown, Gregory	Teacher, K-12	As the ELA Department Chair, Ms. Bolden will review academic and behavior Tier 1 data and evaluate how Tier 1 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Aurelia Williams

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
62

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	72%
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* Native American Students* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	410	402	421	0	0	0	0	1233
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	29	49	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	60	46	0	0	0	0	202
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	123	133	0	0	0	0	359
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	140	151	0	0	0	0	401

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	100	113	114	0	0	0	0	327

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/15/2020

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	407	399	420	0	0	0	0	1226
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	75	58	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	172	146	0	0	0	468

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	38	61	49	0	0	0	0	148

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

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	407	399	420	0	0	0	0	1226
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	75	58	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	172	146	0	0	0	468

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	38	61	49	0	0	0	0	148

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

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	48%	43%	54%	48%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	49%	54%	49%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	45%	47%	41%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	53%	49%	58%	45%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	50%	57%	40%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	47%	51%	36%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	57%	44%	51%	50%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	68%	72%	64%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
	2018	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
	2018	42%	41%	1%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	54%	49%	5%	56%	-2%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
	2018	40%	42%	-2%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	37%	47%	-10%	54%	-17%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	54%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	32%	32%	0%	46%	-14%
	2018	42%	31%	11%	45%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	44%	40%	4%	48%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	67%	30%	67%	30%
2018	98%	63%	35%	65%	33%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	69%	3%	71%	1%
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
Compare		-26%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	57%	22%	61%	18%
2018	98%	61%	37%	62%	36%
Compare		-19%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	61%	37%	57%	41%
2018	96%	57%	39%	56%	40%
Compare		2%			

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	18	46	46	28	51	46	28	58	77		

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
ELL	20	49	52	30	43	43	21	55	67		
ASN	58	73	58	74	60		75	80	71		
BLK	35	48	48	39	44	40	41	65	81		
HSP	41	51	53	47	46	38	42	68	79		
MUL	58	48	42	64	58	58	79	96	89		
WHT	59	57	53	63	58	43	68	84	84		
FRL	38	53	53	42	47	39	41	68	78		

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	19	37	31	28	42	37	20	55			
ELL	18	41	35	31	50	45	22				
ASN	71	61		75	68		90	100	90		
BLK	35	44	32	40	52	49	40	98	81		
HSP	37	46	42	42	52	52	34	97	89		
MUL	52	44		51	61	47	47	100	73		
WHT	56	52	37	66	63	55	67	94	84		
FRL	37	44	34	42	52	50	43	95	80		

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	13	36	38	17	34	41	13	45			
ELL	11	31	32	22	38	34	20	25			
ASN	72	74		72	63		61	94	96		
BLK	32	41	44	30	36	39	32	50	70		
HSP	40	44	26	39	43	39	41	51	70		
MUL	58	54		49	36	33	56	88	71		
WHT	59	54	43	54	40	26	65	74	80		
FRL	36	44	37	32	35	36	38	51	71		

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	56
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	43
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	69
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	49
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	51
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	62
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	51
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.

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA data, the LPQ math component showed the lowest performance. One teacher resign and another went out on FMLA due to his wife medical issue. The students missed out on daily effective instruction with a teacher who skills set could meet the individual needs of students instead of the group. Due to COVID-19, the FSA was cancelled, but the data from District assessments showed this component moving in the positive direction in double digits.

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

Civics showed the lowest performance. The reason for the decline is that only level 5s (85 students) were put in the course the previous year which yielded 96% proficiency. Due to the previous scheduling, the 2018-2019 school year yielded (385) students with (115) students with a lexile under 600. Scheduling students appropriately will allow for a natural progression of learning and growth.

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.

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA data, the LPQ math component showed the lowest performance. One teacher resign and another went out on FMLA due to his wife medical issue. The students missed out

on daily effective instruction with a teacher who skills set could meet the individual needs of students instead of the group.

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

LPQ Reading component showed the most improvement. We used the Reading Coach as an Interventionist to work with students who were ten points away from the next proficiency bucket. The District Specialist also worked with students in small groups who hadn't mastered three of our highly assessed standards. This practice continued during the 2019-2020 school year.

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

Based on 2018-2019 data, Level 1 on Statewide Assessment and Attendance below 90%

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

1. Instructional Practice
2. Effective Leadership
3. Supportive Environment- Culture and Climate
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reflecting on our Standards Walk-through data, the Area of Focus is student tasks and activities as it relates to standards based instruction. The data revealed that the instruction matched the information on the focus board and the materials used were aligned with the standards, but the students tasks and activities did not often coordinate with the standards which impacted the appropriate alignment to the learning arc of the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	By December 2020, we will shift from a .8 to 1.5 on the learning arc because teachers will engage in standards based instruction learning plans procedures.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaborate and engage in tiered professional learning opportunities involving unpacking standards to create aligned activities and tasks that are appropriate for where the teacher should be in the learning arc of the standard. Based on Standards Walk-through Tool, our team can measure classrooms that have aligned tasks and activities that coordinate with the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration and engaging in tiered professional learning opportunities will allow teachers the opportunity to work together on potential solutions to common barriers that are impacting student individual and collective achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teachers time during planned Faculty meetings and Common Planning to collaborate and engage in tiered professional learning opportunities for incorporating student use and understanding of the standards. Teachers will vet instructional materials to create standard aligned activities and tasks to support standard mastery. WE will use the Standard Walk-through form to guide the discussion.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

2. Provide teachers with the learning opportunity to participate in common planning sessions with administration and Gifted Lead teacher to brainstorm solutions to common barriers, to utilize standard aligned activities and tasks to create FSA equivalent experience aligned assessments using the item spec rationale and standards. We will use the Standard Walk-through form to guide the discussion.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

3. Focus Walks opportunities will be created by Admin to allow time for teachers to observe best practices of the targeted focus. We will use the Standard Walk-through form to guide the debriefing.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

4. Admin completing Standard Walk-through to ensure we have shared common definitions, evidence, and expectations across the school which will lead to evidence that our content teams consistently plan standards- based instruction with aligned tasks and assessments. Admin will complete at least 2 walks together a day to ensure calibration is strong.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	High standards for teaching and learning are the result of a strong leadership team that functions as an active and skilled group. Due to decline from 66 on the 2018-2019 UChicago Survey to 62 on the 2019-2020 school year survey, Instructional Leadership has been identified as a the Area of Focus.
Measurable Outcome:	Instructional leadership will increase from 62 to 70 on the 2020-2021 UChicago survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide opportunities for department chairs to increase and build their own leadership capacity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Instructional Leadership team is stronger when more personnel are actively engaged in the observations and feedback process. Department chairs will be better prepared to provide feedback that reflects the one common voice that is aligned with standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Leadership Team, to include administrators, dept chairs, school counselor, dean, to meet on a monthly basis to review current academic and discipline data, SIP goals, and new barriers.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Instructional Leadership Team will review feedback from Standards walk-through observations to help shape the work in content PLCs.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Instructional Leads to support and guide department chairs in leading PLC with their content area by using the feedback from the Standards walk-through observations with teacher lesson/student work.

Person Responsible	Sharonette Shaw (shaws@duvalschools.org)

Department chairs will work alongside the instructional lead to develop the agenda for content area PLC based on the feedback from the Standards walk-through observations.

Person Responsible	Naomi Ronek (ronekn@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic growth is higher when students feel safe both in and around the school building and when they travel to and from home. Due to an already extremely low score, and a further decline from 2 on the 2018-2019 UChicago Survey to 1 on the 2019-2020 school year survey, school safety was identified as the Area of Focus.
Measurable Outcome:	School safety will increase from 1 to 20 on the 2020-2021 UChicago survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Naomi Ronek (ronekn@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide students with information regarding emergency procedures on a daily basis. Reduce the number of students in the restroom and hallways and all students moving in the same direction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Verbally preparing students for an emergency situation, so if an event happens they will be able to recall action steps. Limiting the number of students in the hallways and restrooms will also make the environment less overwhelming and easier to supervise for teachers in the hallway. Posting GFS in specific locations to remind students of the expected behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

Incorporate ERT protocol in morning announcements.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Signage posted inside restroom doors and inside restrooms pertaining to Restroom Guidelines for Success and maximum capacity 2 students. Restrooms will be monitored during transition by teachers and during instructional time by security guards.

Person Responsible	Naomi Ronek (ronekn@duvalschools.org)

Grade levels will have a staggered transition, with only 1 grade level in the hallways at a time. Hallways will have one-directional movement.

Person Responsible	Naomi Ronek (ronekn@duvalschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Becoming a school with a strong culture focus on standards based instruction, this will help us to identify, progress monitor, and incorporate targeted intervention to address the academic and social needs of students who are showing signs based on the Early Warning indicators. As we are making this shift, it will allow us to identify students early. We can incorporate the academic and social interventions to meet the needs of the student earlier than before the shift, and utilize a system based on data from aligned assessments to progress monitor the students. This should decrease the number of students who exhibit Early Warning indicators.

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.

To build a more culturally sensitive environment for all stakeholders. Twin Lakes will continue with effective and consistence communicate between school and home using our various communication vehicles in English and Spanish (when available). Parents will be encouraged to attend and join the monthly decision making bodies (SAC and PTSA). After events, we will have surveys to gather parents feedback. We will increase student engagement and presence by increasing opportunities for students to have a voice in how they learn. Encourage teachers to build a solid relationship with students and parents. We will continue with the Wolves Den and TLAM Bucks as incentive for positive behavior. For teachers, we will continue to provide professional development on creating a culturally sensitive learning environment. We will also continue to build capacity in our teacher leaders and providing opportunities for others to lead and share their craft with others. Admin will continue to celebrate and serve our teachers monthly to show our appreciation.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.