

Duval County Public Schools

Waterleaf Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Brady Hewitt G

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	67%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

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

Waterleaf Elementary School develops inquisitive, independent thinkers and collaborative learners, who acquire the essential knowledge necessary to be career and college ready, and to be caring and creative contributors to the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Waterleaf Elementary School will foster an earnest passion for learning that inspires students to work with others in creating a better world for all.

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
Bergfeld, Kimberly	Teacher, ESE	Teaches Gifted students; Leadership team
Brady Hewitt, Lisa	Principal	
Kratz, Laura	School Counselor	Guidance
Witucki, Julie	Teacher, ESE	
Mickle, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
Burgos, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Gatehouse, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	
Kogan, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Roberts, Paige	Teacher, K-12	
Jensen, Kim	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/29/2020, Lisa Brady Hewitt G

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

58

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	128	126	119	112	110	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Attendance below 90 percent	18	17	16	23	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	41	39	56	37	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	63	74	63	55	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287

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	41	44	49	39	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200

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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

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	22	20	16	14	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15	51	37	50	42	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262

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	5	28	25	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	7	10	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	20	16	14	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15	51	37	50	42	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262

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	5	28	25	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	7	10	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	64%	50%	57%	65%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	63%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	42%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	62%	63%	75%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	74%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	54%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	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	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
	2018	69%	50%	19%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	62%	50%	12%	56%	6%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	61%	10%	62%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	30	44	27	40	46	34	39				
ELL	41	63	53	55	74	58	42				
ASN	76	58		90	71		73				
BLK	52	54	27	59	54	32	41				
HSP	58	59	50	58	67	50	53				
MUL	69	50		75	75						
WHT	67	64	50	74	61	53	74				
FRL	55	53	41	61	58	35	48				
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	32	41	37	49	60	57	52				
ELL	40	42	33	60	37						
ASN	82	66		96	79		88				
BLK	52	43	35	50	43	35	37				
HSP	57	60	47	66	59	54	62				
MUL	68	69		82	53						
WHT	71	62	43	84	66	56	83				

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
FRL	55	50	38	64	56	41	58				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	38	51	40	50	61	52	29				
ELL	38	44	38	67	56						
ASN	67	75		86	88		75				
BLK	58	61	41	61	73	67	60				
HSP	47	49	38	64	54	38	38				
MUL	63	50		88	72						
WHT	75	71	38	82	80	58	67				
FRL	54	53	42	66	70	52	49				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	71
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	46
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	59
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	67
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	63
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	52
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.

SWD scored 37% in the ESSA data. The subgroup goal is 41% or above. Students with Disabilities weren't targeted as much for grade level academic goals as they were for IEP goals. Students weren't held to the grade level standard on a consistent basis.

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

SWD in math. Went from 57% growth in 2018 to 34% growth in 2019. Students with Disabilities weren't targeted as much for grade level academic goals as they were for IEP goals. Students weren't held to the grade level standard on a consistent basis.

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.

Lowest 25th percentile in math and in reading. LPQ in math: school was 44% and state was 51%. LPQ in reading: school was 43% and state was 53%. 75% of our LPQ in both subjects are SWD. Students with Disabilities weren't targeted as much for grade level academic goals as they were for IEP goals. Students weren't held to the grade level standard on a consistent basis.

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

Reading LPQ improved 3% and Math Learning Gains improved 3%. We introduced a new program that targeted all students at their level and created small group instruction to meet their individual needs and address gaps in their learning.

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

Students with Disabilities is an area of concern.
LPQ is an area of concern.

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

1. Increase the LPQ growth.
2. Increase the SWD growth.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities is a focus because we are below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

SWD will increase from 37% to 41% or above on ESSA Federal Index.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

SWD will receive intensive intervention through RtI daily for a minimum of 20 minutes. RtI will consist of small groups (2-5 students) and will use intervention materials based on individual need. This will be in addition to their IEP goals and their time spent with their ESE teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

RtI is research-based and, done with fidelity, will increase a student's growth. Criteria is based on scores on several assessments (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000, District Benchmarks, FSA). These are used to place students into intervention groups. Resources are materials provided by the district (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000; BAS; LLI; Phonics for Reading.)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collect data from diagnostics in Aug. (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000; Benchmark assessments)
2. Analyze the data to form groups
3. Form groups based on individual need.

Person

Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

4. Schedule an RtI block for each grade level and provide extra assistance to ensure small group size.
5. Implement RtI.
6. Monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth as assessed by running records, standards based grade level assessments.
6. Analyze data; create new groups; continue the process

Person

Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Assessing student learning as students move through the standard. Formative assessment based on daily tasks, exit tickets, and student understanding of the material impacts instructional decisions and evidence of alignment of instruction, task, assessment. Assessing student Learning was identified via the Standards Walk-Through tool. Dials indicate a 2.8/5.0 for overall Assessing Student Learning; .6/1.0 for Determining Mastery; 1.0/2.0 for Learning Arc Alignment; and 1.0/2.0 for FSA Alignment.

Measurable Outcome: Assessing Student Learning will increase overall from 2.8 to 4.0 or higher. Sub-categories will increase by a minimum of .4 on each category.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Learning Arc template will be used to align assessment to the standard to ensure the task can allow students to show mastery of the standard, or the part of the standard focused on; aligns with the standard; and is FSA aligned.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This specific strategy allows for professional learning when unpacking the standard. It creates an Arc for deeper knowledge of the standard, allowing teachers to instruct students on every aspect of the standard. By doing so, teachers will be able to create tasks and assessments that will align to the standard and show student mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC will be held to introduce the Learning Arc protocol for each chosen standard.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

PLC will be used to move through the first 4 steps of the learning arc. Unpacking the standard, understanding the vocabulary of the standard, utilizing resources, and breaking the standard down into objectives.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Common Planning to create/identify aligned tasks and assessment opportunities.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Analyze assessment data for the standard and make decisions for whole group/small group/individual remediation if necessary.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus for culture and environment is creating a supportive environment where students feel safe and value hard work. This area of focus is based on the 5-Essentials Survey. Our weakest subgroup under supportive environment was Peer Support for Academic Work. In this area students stated that their peers are not motivated to take the necessary steps to achieve academic success. The specific data shows that based on student response our school scored very weak in this area of the 5-Essentials Survey. Students who have the tools to focus, stay calm, and work hard will have the capacity to dedicate more effort on academic success which is our rationale for choosing this area of focus.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on survey data in the area of peer support for academic achievement in 2019-2020 we scored very weak. Our goal for the 2020-2021 school year is to get to neutral.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We need to have a clear school-wide set of expectations and celebrate student success both academically and emotionally. We will also implement calm classroom techniques school wide to foster a supportive learning environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the article One Way to Celebrate Success: The Caught Being Good Campaign by "Imagine Hope Community Charter School" setting and communicating clear expectations and rewarding student success allows everyone to work toward the same goals. Celebrating successes in a fun way builds peer support which enables the students and families to understand school values. Additionally, calm classroom curriculum which supports mindfulness to empower students with mindfulness skills for social and emotional wellbeing. 1. file:///C:/Users/gatehousej/Downloads/SE-Peer%20Support%20for%20Academic%20Work-One%20Way%20to%20Celebrate%20Success-The%20Caught%20Being%20Good%20Campaign.pdf 2. calmclassroom.com

Action Steps to Implement

1. Calm Classroom: curriculum implemented three times daily.
2. Setting and communicating clear expectations within the classroom.
3. Creating risk free environments where students feel comfortable expressing their need for help and allowing other students to be a part of that assistance.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

LPG in Reading and Math—Students will be placed in small group instruction to ensure growth in the specific subject. Leadership team will monitor assessments and academic progress monthly to ensure students are showing growth and teachers are implementing the academic plan for each student.

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.

Stakeholders are invited monthly to the School Advisory Council meetings. Vision, mission, and School Improvement Plans are discussed and amended as needed with input from parents, students, faculty, and community participants.

Positive school culture is built through our daily announcements, monthly student of the month activities, positive reinforcements for daily activities, community events such as Book Fair, Carnival, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and Girls On the Run.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00