

Duval County Public Schools

# Kernan Trail Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Kernan Trail Elementary School

2281 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Suzanne Shall M**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (62%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Kernan Trail Elementary School

2281 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

### 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	69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

### 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.

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, everyday

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Kernan Trail Elementary is a strategically designed standards-based learning community focused on creating relationships with all stakeholders, crafting relevant, engaging, and aligned instruction, and achieving stellar results.

### 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
Shall, Suzanne	Principal	Curriculum & Instruction, Building Management
Dunavant, Marcy	Other	CSS Site Coach
Lamberson, Ricky	Teacher, K-12	Teacher, Extended Day Director
	Instructional Technology	Clayton Dudjak, Technology Teacher, Safety Lead
Young, Anne Marie	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead, 4/5 ESE Literacy Teacher
Cannington, Ashley	Assistant Principal	AP

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Suzanne Shall M

**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (62%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 6/23/2020

**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	92	104	120	110	120	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	7	21	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	10	6	7	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**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	2	11	18	30	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

**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	2	4	4	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	92	104	120	110	120	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	7	21	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	10	6	7	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**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	2	11	18	30	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

**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	2	4	4	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	71%	50%	57%	68%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	56%	58%	66%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	62%	63%	82%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	63%	62%	76%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	71%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	48%	53%	59%	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	65%	51%	14%	58%	7%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
	2018	68%	49%	19%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	64%	50%	14%	56%	8%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	72%	57%	15%	60%	12%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
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	47	63	59	60	58	45	50				
ELL	70	73	62	70	68	36	61				
ASN	83	65		93	76		70				
BLK	64	55	47	76	67	50	68				
HSP	65	72	61	80	72	48	54				
MUL	86	69		82	69						
WHT	74	71	56	85	75	50	66				
FRL	62	64	43	75	68	49	63				
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	49	47	32	53	53	36	53				
ELL	71	74	40	81	68						
ASN	81	72		91	77		75				
BLK	60	60	35	73	57	50	56				
HSP	67	67	62	75	60	56	67				
MUL	87	72		83	61		90				
WHT	78	68	71	89	65	58	89				
FRL	70	64	45	79	62	52	68				
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	34	55	53	49	58	57	33				
ELL	43	44		77	63	70					
ASN	67	55		96	77						
BLK	67	68	53	74	68	74	60				
HSP	53	61	64	71	74		44				
MUL	88	78		92	67						
WHT	73	67	53	88	84	80	73				
FRL	62	59	47	76	70	68	45				

### 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	67
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	64
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	77
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	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	66

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	77
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	68
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	62
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.**

Science achievement data declined from 75% to 65% proficiency. This decline was anticipated due to the diverse group of 5th grade learners over the previous cohort, and paralleled the cohort's Reading FSA performance as well. The cohort had over triple the number of SWD and ELL students over the previous cohort.

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

Math proficiency for ELL students decreased by 11%, but their Math learning gains remained constant at 68%. ELL students entering had language barriers to overcome.

**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.**

We exceed the state averages in every content area.

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

Our Lowest Performing Readers gained by 8% and our Math Learning Gains increased by 9%. Targeted, prescriptive small group instruction was given during the reading and math core work periods. In addition, we had two certified teachers who tutored LLI with our LPQ readers, and a math tutor who provided push in and pull out service for our 4th and 5th struggling mathematicians.

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

Attendance remains a challenge for students who are not mastering grade level standards.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. Lowest Performing Math
4. Reading Gains
5. Peer Collaboration & Culture

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

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

There is a strong correlation between reading proficiency and academic success at all levels. Proficient readers develop a greater vocabulary, understand texts at a deeper level, and gain knowledge in a variety of content areas and contexts. "In one of the most extensive studies of reading yet conducted, Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding traced reading growth to reading and reading volume. They found that the amount of time students spent reading was the best predictor of reading achievement." – Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding (1988).

Research supports that students who are reading on grade level in elementary school are much more likely to graduate and be college and career ready.

**Measurable Outcome:** Seventy-five percent proficiency will be shown by our intermediate readers on the Florida Standards Assessment in Reading.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Standards-Aligned instruction Tier I using research-based, proven reading curriculum. Prescriptive Small Groups based on analysis of formative assessment data.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Standards-aligned instruction using a core curriculum will allow teachers to formatively assess student progress toward mastering standards. When formative assessment is analyzed, prescriptive instruction is given based on a student's continued need. Common assessment and collegial conversations among teachers will allow for cohesive horizontal instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- A) Units of Study in Reading and Writing, and K-2 Phonics will be implemented according to the Pacing Guide.
- B) Small Group prescriptive instruction will be used to meet students' needs.
- C) Weekly Teacher Meetings will be conducted to monitor student progress.
- D) Unit and Lesson alignment to the Florida Standards will be implemented.
- E) Common Cold Reading Assessments will be administered.
- F) Student writing work will be analyzed.
- G) IReady Reading and Achieves 3000 weekly lessons and teacher analysis of data for small groups.
- H) Implementation of Guided Reading
- I) Leveled Literacy Intervention Identification and Implementation for at risk readers
- J) A reading tutor will continue to work with at risk students in Tier III.

**Person Responsible**

Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Science, a part of the exponentially growing STEM field, is important for college and career readiness. Our students are growing up in an increasingly scientific and technological world that requires them to be scientifically literate.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Science proficiency will increase from 65% proficiency to 75% proficiency on the Grade 5 state exam.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Standards-aligned core instruction with embedded hands on experiences and the integration of technology resources.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	When state science standards drive instruction infused with hands on experiences and the integration of technology resources, student achievement in science increases.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- A) Use of Science Standards to Drive Instruction
- B) Small Group prescriptive instruction will be used to meet students' needs.
- C) Weekly Teacher Meetings will be conducted to monitor student progress.
- E) Science Assessments will be administered.
- F) Student writing work will be analyzed.
- G) Integration of Science Technology Resources: Discovery Education, Generation Genius, Gizmos

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will intentionally focus on the instructional practice of formative assessment in reading to analyze a student's level of mastery of the standards. Formative assessment will include questioning and responses, but also exit tickets that are aligned to the response mechanisms of FSA to tie the authentic units of study teaching to the FSA style of questioning. Formative reading assessment will allow us to make prescriptive instructional decisions for whole group, small group, and conferring sessions.

**Measurable Outcome:** For at least three reading lessons a week, formative assessment will be given to measure students mastery of the focus standard.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teacher questioning and student responses, student journal entries, and completed FSA style exit tickets aligned with the mentor texts.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Reading is essential to students' success in school and life. Focusing on formative assessment will allow the teacher to pivot and meet the needs of students who are not reaching mastery of the grade level standards. This must be done when authentically reading but also must have a focus on FSA style questions to prepare students for standardized assessment.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Reading teacher teams will write FSA style exit tickets aligned with the item specifications and response mechanisms of the FSA from their mentor text to assess students mastery of the focus standard.

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

Common cold assessments will be used to formative assess student progress and prescriptively plan instructional next steps.

**Person Responsible** Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

Guided reading formative assessment will be used to measure student progress and pivot instruction.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#4. Other specifically relating to Teacher Collaboration and Trust****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

On the 5 Essentials Survey, teacher to teacher trust was weak in the area of collaborative teachers. Upon analysis of the results, intermediate teachers felt a strong sense of collegiality while primary teachers did not. Overall, primary teachers felt like the teams didn't work collaboratively as a whole and were not contributing school improvement efforts as a whole. As an A school for over 16 years, and with Common Planning Time, Weekly Teacher Meetings, Instructional Round Observations, and book studies on Relationship Building, This was a surprising results on the survey. Building trust among colleagues will be a central focus this upcoming year to move our school culture and collaboration forward.

**Measurable Outcome:** On the 5 Essentials Survey, the area of Teacher Collaboration specifically with teacher to teacher trust will increase from weak to strong.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Team Meetings to discuss the 5 Essentials data and brainstorm next steps will be utilized. Articles on relationship building with colleagues will be used for discussion groups. Teacher collective ownership in committees and Teacher Meetings will be part of our strategy, as well as Instructional Rounds.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Group and individual discussions to identify the root cause of the teacher feelings will be needed to achieve next steps. This will take the Discussion Group format, article study, and Committee Group collaboration.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Reorganization of Grade Level Teams to maximize teacher collaboration.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Collaborative Discussion Groups to analyze the survey results, and discuss what each question was meant to measure.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Collaborative Discussion Groups to plan for next steps to move the Teacher Collaboration and Teacher To Teacher Trust.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Article Study on building teacher trust pertaining to the next step within the 5 Essentials Survey for Empowering Teachers.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Study the 5 Languages of Appreciation in the Workplace by Gary Chapman.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Conduct a Personality Survey

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Instructional Rounds to better understand other teacher's practice in their classroom.

**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.

**Other school-wide priorities include the learning gains of our Lowest Performing mathematicians, the reading gains of all students, and the peer collaboration of the teachers.**

**Math teachers will plan and implement Eureka math and iReady math. LPQ mathematicians will be identified and placed in prescriptive small groups within the classroom to receive additional instruction.**

**Literacy teachers will plan and implement small group instruction using Guided Reading, LLI, and Strategy Groups to meet the needs of every student.**

**To advance peer collaboration, strategic placement of teachers within grade levels is implemented, common planning by content area is scheduled, and horizontal teacher collegiality in Teacher Meetings and Early Release is scheduled.**

## 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.

Creating relationships is foundational to our work. Relationships among colleagues are promoted through team building activities, collegial dialogue and sharing of ideas, and collaborative academic planning. Colleagues, including classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, ESE teachers, Speech, OT, and PT work collaboratively to meet the needs of every student, and work closely to communicate with parents about student's social, emotional, and academic progress. Relationships among staff members and students is an essential element. Students who feel loved work hard for teachers, and the students know that they can count on our respect as we have their best interest at heart.

We use a school theme to bring school unity and promote our brand. The school theme changes yearly but

consists of a tag line related to our STEAM School Choice option. This year, our theme is Dive Deep in a Sea of Wonder to focus on Researcher's Workshop and Inquiry. The school is decorated based on the theme and PTA gathers business partnership support to buy each staff member and student a themed t-shirt. Shirts are worn on Fridays to promote unity. Further, the school activities, assemblies, and events are generally based around our yearly theme.

PTA and SAC meet monthly with school administration as key contributors in promoting our school culture and attainment of academic goals. This close partnership is a key connection for us to garner all perspectives.

#### **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: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Teacher Collaboration and Trust	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00