

Duval County Public Schools

Biltmore Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Biltmore Elementary School

2101 W PALM AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32254

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

Demographics

Principal: Sabrina Session Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2006

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Biltmore Elementary School

2101 W PALM AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32254

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Biltmore Family will be responsible and committed to helping students LEAD.

Learn to put first things first

Expect to excel

Accept responsibility

Decide to set and meet academic and social goals

Provide the school's vision statement.

To grow great leaders beyond the classroom.

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
Session Jones, Sabrina	Principal	Provides a shared vision and mission for the school. Ensures data driven decision making, continuous professional development, and retention of highly qualified teachers and staff. The principal provides instructional leadership to ensure State standards are taught in a safe learning environment and students make adequate progress toward school goals. Manages school operations and responsible fiscal allocations.
Karst-Smith, Susan	Teacher, ESE	Consult with special education and general education teachers to provide additional strategies and interventions to support MTSS and implementation of IEP/504 accommodations according to State and Federal regulations.
Kuo, Josephine	Teacher, K-12	Provide information about instruction and effective instructional practices, deliver and collaborate with teachers with the delivery of MTSS.
Axon, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	Provide information about instruction and effective instructional practices, deliver and collaborate with teachers with the delivery of MTSS.
Chandler, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Provide and facilitate professional development to assist in problem solving. In addition, the coach shares evidenced based resources and best practices, provide assistance of problem solving through data collection, data analysis, and coaching.
Towns, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with instructional leadership responsibilities, specifically math and science. Monitors early warning indicators such as absenteeism and severe behavior issues and ensure that appropriate wrap around services are provided to the students and/or family.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2006, Sabrina Session Jones

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	35	43	51	57	34	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	4	11	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	3	3	8	20	22	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	3	2	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/30/2020

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	55	51	66	50	66	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	343
Attendance below 90 percent	22	24	20	22	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	7	2	4	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	20	30	35	20	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162

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	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	55	51	66	50	66	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	343
Attendance below 90 percent	22	24	20	22	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	7	2	4	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	20	30	35	20	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162

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	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	42%	50%	57%	28%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	50%	53%	64%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	62%	63%	52%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	63%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	51%	77%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	48%	53%	22%	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	36%	51%	-15%	58%	-22%
	2018	26%	50%	-24%	57%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	23%	52%	-29%	58%	-35%
	2018	17%	49%	-32%	56%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	16%	50%	-34%	56%	-40%
	2018	30%	51%	-21%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	64%	-26%	64%	-26%
	2018	37%	60%	-23%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	30%	57%	-27%	60%	-30%
	2018	63%	61%	2%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	16%	49%	-33%	53%	-37%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	22%	56%	-34%	55%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	67	60	55	71	70	50				
BLK	41	52	59	53	51	44	29				
WHT	58			67							
FRL	40	49	56	52	49	47	27				
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	53	65		51	42						
BLK	35	33	13	53	38	20	36				
WHT	31	64		63	73						
FRL	34	37	24	53	43	24	41				
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	7			20							
BLK	29	60	58	50	59	77	23				
WHT	20										
FRL	30	64	64	53	60	75	25				

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	49
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
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	47
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	46
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.

The lowest performance area was science. Science proficiency decreased six percentage points. A contributing factor to the 2019 performance was issues with staffing. A novice teacher was hired in January. The teacher was striving to understand standards and incorporate hands on learning.

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

Overall, the school improved in all areas. However, an analysis of raw data showed a decrease in fifth grade math proficiency. A contributing factor to this decrease was issues with staffing. The greatest decline was in the area of science.

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.

The component showing the largest gap when compared to the state average was ELA proficiency (15 pts.). Although the gap is closing, data shows that students struggle with integration of knowledge of ideas and craft and structure categories.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was ELA lowest 25. This component increased 34 points. New actions our school took was the inclusion of SLA teachers in common planning with

general education teachers when possible and professional development on understanding Florida Standards Access Points and using aligned activities.

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

Areas of concern are students having less than 90% attendance and students having one or more suspensions.

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

1. Science proficiency
2. Culture and climate
3. Reading Achievement
4. Math Proficiency
5. Standards Based Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increasing science proficiency is a critical component as students need to know and understand how the world around them works. As evidenced by the decreased performance of students in this area of 6 percentage points and 15 percentage points below the district average this area remains a challenge.

Measurable Outcome: Science proficiency will increase to 40% from 33% as measured by the Florida State Assessment (FSA) by May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Towns (townst@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Manipulation Strategy or "hands on" allows students to learn using concrete and tangible things. Auditory, visual, tactile, and kinesthetic learners will benefit from manipulating objects. Students manipulate physical objects in order to experience science first hand.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The manipulation strategy allows students to be active learners who build on their own understanding and draw meaning from their experiences.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted professional development in the development of concept maps and inquiry strategies.

Person Responsible Kimberly Chandler (chandlerk@duvalschools.org)

Implementation of data driven learning center activities related to concept.

Person Responsible Tiffany Towns (townst@duvalschools.org)

Make apparatuses available for students to operate such as microscopes, balances, and stop watches to collect and analyze data.

Person Responsible Tiffany Towns (townst@duvalschools.org)

Increase field experiences to allow students to inquire and observe science, nature and animals first hand. These experiences will contribute to increased academics in science, reading and mathematics Students will experience school based presentations or visit MOSH, Diamond D. Ranch, St. Augustine, and StarBase.

Person Responsible Tiffany Towns (townst@duvalschools.org)

Students will use Study Island computer based program to review important science concepts and ongoing progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Tiffany Towns (townst@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Enhance Response to Intervention (RTI) components school-wide. As evidenced by historical reading data trends students have consistently performed below the District and State proficiency average. If we improve progress monitoring and intensive interventions student reading skills will improve.

Measurable Outcome: Increase reading proficiency from 42 percent to 48 percent as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) by May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Components of effective Response to Intervention include universal screening, effective core instruction, progress monitoring, and intensive intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According Fisher, Frey & Hattie (2016) Response to intervention has an effect size of (1.07).

Action Steps to Implement

Analyse Universal Screening data to identify students in need of tier 2 and tier 3 interventions and develop aligned RTI plans.

Person Responsible Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will meet with teachers monthly to monitor student response to interventions based on progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Susan Karst-Smith (smiths30@duvalschools.org)

Support staff (paraprofessionals, reading interventionists, and part time hourly tutors) will support students in small groups to develop foundation skills.

Person Responsible Tiffany Towns (townst@duvalschools.org)

Purchase additional/ supplemental instructional materials, supplies, and resources to support differentiated instruction and the varied instructional needs of general education and special education students.

Person Responsible Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Focus Description and Rationale: According to early warning indicator data, 50 students had attendance below 90 percent. Students who have chronic absenteeism miss important skills and knowledge. Students reported weak student- teacher trust on the 5Essentials student survey.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students having an average attendance rate below 90 percent will decrease by 20%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: If we enhance teacher- student relationships, we can better identify, understand, and address the social and emotional needs of our students and increase their desire to attend school regularly. Teacher- student relationships include positive, trusting relationships, teacher clarity in expectations, equity and fairness in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Fisher, Frey, & Hattie (2016) teacher- student relationships has an effect size of (0.72).

Action Steps to Implement

Implement Calm Classroom School-wide and Culture of Caring with fidelity.

Person Responsible Tiffany Towns (townst@duvalschools.org)

Self assess faculty and staff mind self and implement a faculty book study using The Growth Mindset Coach: A teacher's Month-by- Month Handbook for Empowering Students to Achieve by Annie Brock and Heather Hundley with monthly professional development.

Person Responsible Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

Refer chronically absent student to the guidance counselor and/or social worker to provide targeted support with self efficacy, esteem, social skills and/or academics.

Person Responsible Jullian Ihnken (ihnkenj@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we enhance collaboration and effective practices to deliver standards aligned instruction student achievement in all academic areas will increase. Trend data shows that although student performance has improved our student performance has been consistently below the district average.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the District Standards-Based School Rating (Standards- Based Planning Category) from (Moderate) to (Good) by the end of the 2020- 2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Promote a collaborative culture through enhanced implementation of professional learning communities and common planning structures.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research supports that a professional learning community is a best practice. According to DuFour & Eaker (1998) characteristics of Professional Learning Community include a shared mission, vision, and values; collective inquiry; collaborative teams; action orientation; continuous improvement; and results orientation.

Action Steps to Implement

The administrative leadership team will self evaluate current state of standards- based instruction at the school using the district Standards- Based School Implementation Rubric and develop a plan to address next steps to improve performance.

Person Responsible Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

Create a clear vision of a professional learning community and clarify the difference between Professional Learning Community and Common Planning.

Person Responsible Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will calibrate and discuss alignment finding through rich conversations and produce actionable next steps.

Person Responsible Sabrina Session Jones (sessions@duvalschools.org)

The common planning process will focus on deep conversations around the standard and result in standards aligned tasks and materials.

Person Responsible Kimberly Chandler (chandlerk@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Leadership Team will continue to monitor math growth through the use of exit tickets and ongoing progress monitoring using additional resources such as Reflex Math and part time hourly tutors who provide intensive math interventions.

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.

First impressions are lasting impressions. For this reason customer service is a priority at our school. Communication is also important to create a positive school culture. Multiple means of communication will be used to ensure that parents and the community are aware of upcoming meetings and events held at the school to include Parent Link phone call system, Communication folders, the marquee, virtual meetings and a monthly newsletter. The school will ensure that stakeholders are involved in the school improvement process by hosting meetings such School Advisory Council and PTA meetings at flexible times. We will continue to seek parent input via surveys to insure that all parents are heard.

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: Science				\$4,606.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		500-Materials and Supplies	0781 - Biltmore Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			Notes: Purchase science materials for hands on activities.			
		690-Computer Software	0781 - Biltmore Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$660.00
			Notes: Study Island			

		300-Purchased Services	0781 - Biltmore Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,446.00
			Notes: Field Experiences admission and transportation			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$103,996.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0781 - Biltmore Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$64,000.00
			Notes: Reading Coach			
		160-Other Support Personnel	0781 - Biltmore Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$24,440.00
			Notes: Paraprofessional			
		239-Other	0781 - Biltmore Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$15,556.00
			Notes: Part time hourly Tutor (during the school day)			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
					Total:	\$108,602.00