John Stockton Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

John Stockton Elementary School

4827 CARLISLE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/stockton

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Brannan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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

John Stockton Elementary School

4827 CARLISLE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/stockton

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	19%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

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.

Our commitment to our learning community is to inspire lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Be a learning community where highly qualified staff, motivated students, devoted parents, and committed business partners work together to create a positive school culture meeting the needs of the 21st century student.

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
Brannan, Stephanie	Principal	The main roles of the administration team is to oversee the instructional and managerial processes of the school. Administration observes, supports, provides professional development and evaluates teachers and all other members of the school. The principal also oversees the school budget, professional development, school activities, and engages stakeholders. The principal also engages with the students on a daily basis providing small group support as well as academic goal setting.
Doss, Angela	Assistant Principal	The main roles of the administration team is to oversee the instructional and managerial processes of the school. Administration observes, supports, provides professional development and evaluates teachers and all other members of the school. The Assistant Principal also oversees transportation, student discipline, professional development, school activities, and engages stakeholders. The Assistant Principal also engages with the students on a daily basis providing small group support as well as academic goal setting.
Johnston, Shelley	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE teacher, she services approximately 20 students in grades K-5, serves as the Professional Development Facilitator (PDF) for our school, serves on a variety of committees such as the literacy committee and is a sponsor for one of our student organizations Anchored4Life. Having served as a literacy coach and an assistant principal in the past, she is a valuable resource to our school and our leadership team.
Edwards, Lindsay	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE teacher, she services approximately 20 students in grades K-5. She also serves as the patrol sponsor, serves on a variety of committees such as the Shared Decisions Making Team and the Sunshine committee, and assists our Morning Media News Crew. She is a valuable resource to our school and our leadership team as she brings 10 years of experience to the table.
Fulton, Sunshine	School Counselor	As a school counselor, Sunshine serves as an advocate for all students. She provides a comprehensive school counseling program that meets the academic and social/emotional needs of our students. She assists students with accessing additional resources needed to ensure they are successful in school. Sunshine facilitates all of our Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings and Multidisciplinary Team meetings. As a former teacher and math coach, Sunshine is also able to provide instructional support to teachers as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Stephanie Brannan

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.*
2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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	64	74	70	83	82	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	8	25	13	10	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	10	30	22	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	7	19	8	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/14/2020

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	68	74	73	87	84	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	68	74	73	87	84	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	85%	50%	57%	78%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	50%	53%	33%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	92%	62%	63%	85%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	82%	63%	62%	77%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	79%	52%	51%	61%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	48%	53%	75%	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	82%	51%	31%	58%	24%
	2018	85%	50%	35%	57%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
	2018	88%	49%	39%	56%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	87%	50%	37%	56%	31%
	2018	80%	51%	29%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	61%	27%	62%	26%
	2018	92%	59%	33%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	97%	64%	33%	64%	33%
	2018	90%	60%	30%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	91%	57%	34%	60%	31%
	2018	92%	61%	31%	61%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	83%	56%	27%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	59	60		64	75						
BLK	64	45		83	74		40				
HSP	93			93							
MUL	100	70		88	70						
WHT	86	72	68	93	83	81	75				
FRL	75	68	62	83	68	71	65				

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	52	50		67	55						
BLK	79	64	70	76	80	60					
HSP	65			88							
MUL	81	71		88	86						
WHT	90	66	69	96	82	88	93				
FRL	84	68	70	88	85	75	71				

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	46	44	33	62	56	50	30				
BLK	54	52	33	62	67	54	55				
HSP	71	72		95	89		90				
MUL	82			76							
WHT	85	60	36	89	77	57	78				
FRL	70	52		75	80	55	62				

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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	65
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
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	93
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	82
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	80
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	70
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 state assessment data, the English Language Arts learning gains and lowest performing quartile were both below 70%. Our 4th grade writing component of the ELA assessment showed only 21% at 7 or above. During the 2018-2019 year, we had 2 new 4th grade language arts teachers and no reading coach or assistant principal to support them. We hired 3 new ELA teachers (4th & 5th grade) for the 2019-2020 school year. The district did not have a prescriptive writing curriculum prior to the 2018-2019 school year. Had we not faced the challenges of COVID19, we were hopeful for gains for the 2019-2020 FSA assessments.

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

Our science data dropped from 83% to 74% (9% points). We had the same teacher using the same materials as she had the year before. We are unsure of the nature as to why her scores declined.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All of our scores were higher than both the district and state averages. However, in looking at the positives, we had the largest gap in math achievement with a difference of 19% points. Our math teachers are strong in their content area.

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

In looking at school wide state assessment data, our math lowest performing quartile improved by 2% points. That was our highest improvement. However, in looking at individual grade levels, 4th grade math achievement went from 92% to 97%, learning gains went from 95% to 97% and math lowest performing quartile went from 89% to 100%. The teachers placed a larger emphasis on differentiation.

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

The number of students who scored a level 1 on the iReady ELA and math assessment is of great concern to us. However, this data is midyear data since our students were not in school for the last quarter due to the pandemic. I feel confident that our students would have made great progress by the end of the year. We do have ELA and math goals in our SIP though.

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

1. Increasing our ELA learning gains from 66% to 70%
2. Increasing our ELA lowest performing quartile from 64% to 70%
3. Increasing science proficiency from 74% to 80%
4. Improving overall writing scores in 4th and 5th grade English Language Arts
5. Maintaining our level 5's in English Language Arts and Math for both 4th and 5th grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	WRITING- Due to COVID19, we are utilizing 2018-2019 FSA data. Only 21% of our 4th grade students scored a 7 or above on the writing portion on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA. Due to COVID and not having data on our incoming 5th graders, we would like to also include 5th graders in our goal this year.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to see at least 50% of our 4th and 5th grade students score a 7 or above on the writing portion of the 2021 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All K-3 teachers will be using the Writing City Research Based Program to ensure students are adequately prepared for 4th and 5th grade. All 4th and 5th grade teachers will use the research based program, Top Score, which will be incorporated into their daily schedule.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers have not had a researched based writing program in several years prior to the 2019-2020 school year. The program will ensure children are writing daily with a purpose, covering a variety of genres. The writing program that will be used is Top Score. Top Score has a proven record of 75% of students being proficient on the writing portion of the ELA FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers have been trained on the program however, continue to provide follow up PD on the writing programs.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

The master schedule will ensure that writing time is built into the daily class schedule.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Administration will monitor the fidelity of implementation through walkthroughs, observations, and student work (practice tests).

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Third grade teachers will utilize the narrative portion of the Top Score Writing Program in the spring to ensure students have the rigor and are ready for 4th grade.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA Learning Gains were 66% and our lowest performing quartile was 64%. 18 of the students who were level 5's for the 2017-2018 school year did not maintain a level 5 for the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to ensure the ELA learning gains and the lowest performing quartile are at a minimum of 70% on the 2020 ELA FSA. We also want our students who scored a level 5 to maintain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide teachers with content specific professional development to better equip them with meeting the needs of their individual students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers have expressed a desire for more collaboration with grade level peers as well as vertical articulation. They have also expressed a desire for more differentiated professional development. This was noted on both the 5 Essentials survey as well as our school based end of year survey.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide PLC time weekly (on an every other week rotational basis) to allow for differentiation so that teachers can collaborate. This time will also allow teachers to do instructional rounding (if COVID19 restrictions permit).

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Faculty meetings will be utilized to provide differentiated professional development based on teacher need and choice.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Teachers and administrators will delve more deeply into the standards through vertical articulation to assist teachers with an understanding of the continuum.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Our gifted lead teacher will work with our ELA teachers to provide them with options for challenging our higher performing students.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Our students will also utilize various blended learning programs such as Freckle and Achieve.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Our ELA teachers are working on their reading competency courses.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Administration will provide support by assisting with small groups for LPQ students as well as book studies for our level 5's (after the COVID19 restrictions lift).

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We had a 9% point decrease in 5th grade science on the 2018-2019 Science FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	We want the 5th grade science proficiency to be at a minimum of 80% for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaborate with colleagues and constituents to ensure there is better alignment in all grades K-5. We will also work to integrate science with other content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In an effort to provide her with support as she is the only 5th grade science teacher, we have established some opportunities for collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement

Our 5th grade science teacher will observe and debrief with other dynamic 5th grade science teachers within the district. (If COVID-19 restrictions permit)

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Our 4th grade science teachers will observe and collaborate with our 5th grade science teacher.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Our 5th grade science teacher will provide professional development to all teachers in grades K-4 on the priority standards, specific scientific vocabulary, and work to ensure our continuum is aligned.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

The PITSCO lab will be used by all 3rd -5th grade students to enhance science instruction.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will collaborate with our constituents to ensure STEM day is more aligned with our standards and curriculum. (If COVID-19 restrictions lift)

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

The science teachers will collaborate with the ELA teachers to ensure non fiction texts are utilized and are aligned to the curriculum.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

PENDA will also be utilized.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2019-2020 school year, we had 22 discipline referrals. When students do not adhere to conduct expectations, it leads to an unsafe environment which hinders student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	We will decrease discipline referrals by 25% by the end of the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased implementation of positive behavior interventions and supports with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that positive behavior interventions decrease negative behaviors and result in a positive school culture.

Action Steps to Implement

Our Guidelines for Success have been modified so that they are more concise and easier for students and faculty to remember. They will be reviewed daily on the morning announcements.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

We updated our behavior flow chart to clearly distinguish which behaviors should be handled in the classroom and which behaviors should be handled by administration. The flow chart also includes a list of consequences and positive reinforcements that can be used by teachers.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Duirng faculty meetings, teachers will have an opportunity to participate in professional development related to creating a positive classroom culture and Social Emotional Learning. Teachers will also be encouraged to participate in Sanford Inspire and FLPBIS professional development.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Our positive behavior intervention plan for the cafeteria will be revised so that students receive immediate reinforcement for good behavior, as opposed to being reinforced only on Fridays.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Examples and non examples of the behavior expectations will be covered on the morning announcements via CC TV.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

CHAMPS expectations will be posted in all common areas and taught throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

We will continue implementation of all of our other school wide positive behavior interventions (E-Tags, Student of the Month, and Pizza with the Principals).

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As evidenced on our Standards Walkthrough Dashboard, the student task alignment which is currently 0.8, shows that the tasks students are completing do not always align with grade level expectations, standards and rigor. Our goal is to align the tasks more closely so that our student task alignment is increased to 1.5 as well as increase student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of our current core content area teachers will engage in the process of effective planning using the learning arc to ensure that student tasks are aligned. By doing so we will raise our dial from 0.8 to 1.5 as well as increase student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All kindergarten through 5th grade teachers will participate in grade level specific administrative common planning sessions using the learning arc.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will have the ability to engage in uninterrupted collaborative discussions centered around standards based instruction. We will provide teachers a step by step process so that eventually they can engage in the process independently as a group.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will work together to unpack the standards in order to gain a deeper understanding of the standards and their components.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Administration will use work protocols for teachers to engage in analyzing student work to ensure alignment with the standards.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will work collaboratively to modify and/or create tasks and assessments that are directly aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Teachers and administration will engage in peer walkthroughs to foster a collaborative approach between colleagues.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All of our areas of focus have been addressed in the III. A.

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.

John Stockton engages the community in a variety of events such as our annual Thanksgiving luncheon, Fall Festival, Grinch Fun Run, STEM day, Art Day, Talent Show, Musical Productions, Book Fairs, awards ceremonies and School dances, just to name a few. We also engage the community via academic nights such as STEM Night and Literacy Night where we provide strategies and support to parents so that they can help their children at home and become part of the learning process. We also encourage community participation through our annual beautification day, as well as, our Career Fair / Touch the Trucks Day. (These events are currently being placed on hold due to COVID19 restrictions.)

As a school with a large military population, we participate in weekly flag raising ceremonies every Monday, as well as, Month of the Military Child in April. This builds support for our military children and brings families together.

We are also fortunate enough to have a strong faith based partnership with Ortega United Methodist Church.

So that we can keep our community abreast of all of the events, we utilize various modes of communication ie... the school marque, the school website, school newsletter, School Messenger email and phone system, Facebook and a bulletin board in the main office.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**					$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**					$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**					$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**					$844.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	

	5100	510-Supplies	0881 - John Stockton Elementary School	Other		$844.08
			Notes: The cost will be to purchase the charms for the students' E-tag chains, which promote positive behavior as well as a positive academic culture.			
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$844.08**