Fort Caroline Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort Caroline Elementary School

3925 ATHORE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/fce

Demographics

Principal: Carlene Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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

Fort Caroline Elementary School

3925 ATHORE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/fce

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The educators at Fort Caroline Elementary are committed to providing high quality educational opportunities that will inspire all students to acquire and use the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in a global economy and culturally diverse world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The educators at Fort Caroline Elementary will challenge each child by meeting his/her individual needs and motivate them to meet a higher academic standard.

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
Stovall, Violet	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader, leads the school in data analysis, instructional improvements including school safety and works as a support system to all faculty, staff and students and all stakeholders at Fort Caroline Elementary.
Parker, Kanzla	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal's job and responsibilities include monitoring instruction, analyzing student data, providing individualized and prescriptive professional development for teachers and support staff members. In addition to these responsibilities, the assistant principal is responsible for increasing student achievement, ensuring managerial operations are effective and consistent. The Assistant Principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community members with securing business partners and serves as the principal designee.
Addison, Alicia	Instructional Coach	• Collaborates and assist teachers with planning of core instruction • Analyzes student data with Leadership Team to determine focus calendars • Implements Tier 2 Interventions • Models high quality teaching and observes novice teachers with feedback follow up • Assists teachers with instructional practices relating to aligned standards instruction • Assist with professional Development, best instructional practices and differentiating instruction for learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/17/2020, Carlene Smith

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.*

3

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

31

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	32	103	101	102	104	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	56	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	34	73	67	52	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/10/2020

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	88	103	101	106	89	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	38	56	39	45	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	2	4	5	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	46	81	73	63	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322

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	45%	50%	57%	34%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	53%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	50%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	62%	63%	51%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	63%	62%	69%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	51%	55%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	48%	53%	41%	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	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
	2018	40%	50%	-10%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
	2018	40%	49%	-9%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	59%	-8%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	60%	57%	3%	60%	0%
	2018	49%	61%	-12%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	49%	-10%	53%	-14%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	55%	-12%
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	27	50		50	68						
ELL	23	36		54	64						
BLK	42	55	69	63	66	42	37				
HSP	40	71		60	82		45				
WHT	55	68		74	82						
FRL	43	58	74	62	72	50	34				
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	33	67		34	67		18				
ELL		50	50		60						
BLK	34	54	63	50	60	41	42				
HSP	52	78		55	67		60				
WHT	64	81		67	75						
FRL	39	58	61	51	64	47	42				

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	12	31	26	24	49	39	13				
ELL	25			50							
BLK	28	50	50	48	69	50	36				
HSP	63	73		63	67						
WHT	44	50		59	61						
FRL	34	53	47	48	67	49	42				

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	59
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	50
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	53
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	60
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
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 iReady data, the students in the Lowest Performing Quartile in Math showed the lowest performance.The decrease in LPQ Math performance has occurred over the last two years. In mathematics, 61% below or approaching proficiency in Numbers and Operations, 66% in Geometry, and 66% in Measurement and Data. A contributing factor was the lack of consistent effective small group instruction with focus and remediation on specific skills and standards.

Collaborative instructional practices will improve these identified areas.

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

Based on iReady data, Math Proficiency and Math Lowest Performing Quartile students showed the greatest decline from the previous year. A contributing factor was the lack of small standards group instruction and the decrease of Common Planning focusing on specific standards.

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.

N/A

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

Lowest Performing Quartile in Reading showed the most improvement. The new actions taken in this area was implementation of Corrective and Reading Mastery programs, para and resource teachers push-in support, Rti Wednesdays, weekly PLC's, after school tutoring with focus on Priority Standards.

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

Two areas of concern is poor attendance and the number of students who scored level 1 on State Standardized Assessments.

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

1. Lowest Performing Quartile in Reading & Math
2. Effective Leadership - Teacher Influence & Program Coherence
3. School Safety

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practices specifically relating to Standards-aligned instruction will start with standards focused Common Planning sessions. Common planning will be dedicated to engaging teachers in planning that will ensure effective standards aligned instruction is planned and implemented. Focused Common Planning sessions will ensure teachers implement instructional practices so students are aware of what they are expected to learn in relation to to the standard. Based on the Standards Walk Through Tool, less than 50% of the classrooms observed used the posted standard to guide student learning. Effective planning for instructional practices will enhance students understanding of what they are expected to learn.
Measurable Outcome:	If effective Standards Focused Common Planning occurs weekly with teachers, then observations in 90% of classrooms visited using the Standards Walk Through Tool, will employ deep student conversations of understanding the standard, alignment of student tasks, assessments and materials will be aligned to the standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective teacher planning and collaboration of unpacking and analyzing the standards for aligned instruction is the strategy implemented for this area of focus. Based on the Standards Walkthrough Tool, admin can measure the effectiveness of planning sessions from observations of student understanding of the standard and learning tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher collaboration during planning and analyzing and unpacking of the standards will ensure clarity of the language and complexity of the standards to enhance student learning and performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly Standards Focused Common Planning sessions.The standard is the focus of all common planning sessions. Teacher conversations and planning will center around the implementation of instruction, the tasks, assessment and ensuring materials are selected that align.

Person Responsible	Alicia Addison (addisona@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning sessions, teachers participate and collaborate in dialogue that is consistent and standards focused with administrators. Teachers submit the Standards Based Common Planning document weekly to administrators to include all indicators aligned with the Walk Through form are included.

Person Responsible	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will meet weekly to discuss alignment findings of classroom observations. The Standards Based Common Planning document will be used to follow up implementation of instruction using the Standards Walk Through Tool with administration.

Person Responsible	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

The administrators will meet regularly to calibrate classroom observations using the Standards Based Walk Through tool across all grade levels and content areas observed. Observations will include student understanding of the task and their performance on assessments, exit tickets, etc.

Person Responsible   Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on student responses on the 5E's Leadership Survey, 62% of the students who responded indicated "they do not feel safe at school -outside around the school". At Fort Caroline we will continue to support the Social Emotional needs of our students by integrating Social Emotional Learning (SEL) programs throughout the school day. SEL teaches students how to understand and manage their emotions, feel and show empathy for others, helps them build positive relationships as well as show empathy for their peers and others in the school environment. When students feel safe and they are able to communicate their fears, they can focus more on learning.
Measurable Outcome:	92% of our students will respond favorable to the question "Do you feel safe at school?" on the 5E's Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kanzla Parker (parkerk4@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Integrate in all classrooms the Calm Classroom Curriculum. Calm Classroom is a daily program that uses simple research-based mindfulness techniques to help students and teachers develop self-awareness, mental focus, and inner calm. All teachers will receive training. Students will also participate in Foundations: A Proactive and Positive Behavior Support System.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Calm Classroom program is a school-wide program and district initiative that will integrate calming techniques and positive student interactions into the classroom culture. The program will cultivate a mindful school climate to help students foster attitudes of respect and kindness towards themselves and others.
	Based on teacher's implementation of the program, discipline referrals and student reporting of incidents, the school can measure the effectiveness of the program.

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will participate in Calm Classroom training in August. The program will be implemented 2-3 times daily in classrooms and facilitated by all classroom teachers.

Person Responsible	Kanzla Parker (parkerk4@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will develop a schedule of implementation in the daily instructional framework by August 14, 2020 and submit to administration.

Person Responsible	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will effectively implement the lessons, as demonstrated in the teacher manuals, 2 -3 times a day. Admin will observe implementation of the program for effectiveness.

Person Responsible	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will provide feedback of effectiveness of program or data supporting the impact of the program during monthly faculty meetings.

Person Responsible	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As evidenced by the 2019-2020 5E's survey, 12% of teachers indicated they were not active partners in the improvement of the school and professional development. Utilizing the strengths of experienced teachers to support professional development empowers the experienced teacher, builds leadership capacity and allows effective veteran teachers to nurture novice teachers, lead and support professional development.
Measurable Outcome:	Teacher positive responses on the 5E's survey, regarding collaboration and leadership process of School Improvement, will increase from 12% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in a needs based survey to determine the need for professional development and determine teacher leadership strengths, so that learning and leadership opportunities are meaningful. Incorporating teacher leadership of Professional Development with peer teachers, will enhance effective instructional practices, teacher leadership development, collective responsibility and school improvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In schools with strong Collective Responsibility, teachers share a strong sense of responsibility for student development, school improvement, and professional growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a needs based/leadership strength survey to identify teacher professional development needs and areas of strengths.

Person Responsible Kanzla Parker (parkerk4@duvalschools.org)

The survey will be sent out with the Pre planning Agenda a week before pre planning to determine PD and teacher facilitators for the first quarter of school. At the end of each quarter there will be a review of the PD facilitated to determine the upcoming quarter's PD and Facilitators.

Person Responsible Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

The survey results will be reviewed by administration to develop a quarterly Professional Development plan and schedule.

Person Responsible Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

Professional Development practices will be monitored through admin and peer observations of effective implementation of instructional practices and student academic performance.

Person Responsible Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Fort Caroline's Lowest Performing Quartile in Math and Science proficiency has declined over the past two years. The school leadership team will address:
• Weekly standards based lesson planning with Instructional Coach, Administrator, Specialist or teacher lead.
• LPQ students to participate in after school tutoring in October-December, with an emphasis on deficient standards from Baseline, PMA and Module Assessments
• Students will participate in after school and Saturday tutoring (Math/Science) during the Fall and Spring
• Instructional Paras and classroom teachers with continual focus of remediating Math Priority Standards and Science.
• Weekly Common Planning and Early Dismissal PLC's will meet to collaborate with Instructional Coaches and Interventionists to plan for instruction that is aligned to standards
• Instructional Paras will work to remediate Science Standards during small group instruction
• Media Specialist will support Science remediation and instruction during the Media block.
• LPQ Math students participate in Rti Wednesdays with a designated Resource teacher.
*** LLI and DI materials will be used as reading interventions with LPQ students during small group instruction.**
'• Administrator-Student monthly data chats with LPQ students to review student data and academic goals to provide additional instructional support.
Implement Tier 2 instruction using resources from the iReady Math/Reading toolkit
• Teachers and Administrators will meet regularly to analyze assessment data to determine Tier 2 instructional focus.

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.

Fort Caroline Elementary plans to build a positive school culture and environment by:
• Providing activities to engage parents, family members and the community in learning that will promote student academic and social growth.
• Teachers will facilitate daily Social Emotion Learning lessons for students to acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.
• Discipline assemblies will take place quarterly to include bus safety and safety procedures commuting to and from school to ensure students feel safe.

• The PBIS team will meet monthly to develop plans for a supportive and fulfilling school environment with conditions that are conducive to learning and meet the needs of all students and staff.
• The school will partner with surrounding businesses, volunteers, non-profits, and stakeholders to bring positive, measurable change to the school.
• The core Leadership Team will meet weekly to develop plans to improve and integrate data, systems, and practices to positively affect student academic outcomes.
* The school will pair new teachers with a novice teacher as their peer teacher to plan, collaborate and provide guidance as a new teacher,
* The administrators will celebrate staff birthdays and provide tangible incentives throughout the year for all staff to enhance staff morale and positive school culture.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00