Woodland Acres Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Woodland Acres Elementary School

328 BOWLAN ST N, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/wae

Demographics

Principal: Shawn Platts

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Woodland Acres Elementary School

328 BOWLAN ST N, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/wae

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	83%

School Grades History

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

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 Mission of Woodland Acres Elementary is to provide a safe, caring, academically challenging environment where each student will become a productive and responsible citizen in a global economy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Woodland Acres Elementary is to provide a safe and civil environment with an emphasis on rigorous standards based curriculum, integrated with grade specific medical themes, laying a foundation for students to pursue academic excellence.

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
Green, Tiffany	Principal	The School-based/ CPST leadership team functions as a committee at the school. This committee is comprised of the School Principal, school instructional leader, that drives the operational and instructional operations of the school. One Assistant principal, that assist in the daily operations of the school and oversees certain instructional subject areas. Our reading and math coaches serve as professional development facilitators as well as instructional models for teachers. The school counselor provides input and support in the area of counseling and behavior interventions. We are fortunate to have both reading and math interventionists who serve our lowest performing students in the area of tier 3 instruction and remediation. Lastly, we have our Professor In Residence and our Clinical Residence Facilitator who serve as liaisons for the University of North Florida. The Leadership Team meets weekly while the CPST team meets minimum once per month to discuss the implementation of the RtI process at the school. The team analyzes the scheduling, materials, and progress monitoring process of RtI for the school. The CPST leadership team develops and revises the school RtI handbook for teachers to use to better understand the various tiers of instruction as well as the appropriate way to collect data and monitor the progress of the students. The CPST leadership team works closely with the RtI problem solving team to provide professional development for teachers regarding the fidelity of the implantation of RtI. Progress monitoring forms and frequency charts are develop through the CPST leadership team as well as RtI implementation plans.
Joseph, Lakeysha	Instructional Coach	
Maxey, Michael	Instructional Coach	
Parris, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Penn, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Shawn Platts

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.*

10

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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	104	104	99	118	61	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	53	40	35	56	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	6	5	2	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	56	88	71	88	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	70	88	79	84	21	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384

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	62	90	71	88	23	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

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	83	98	89	107	58	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	27	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	83	98	89	107	58	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	27	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	32%	50%	57%	36%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	53%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	55%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	62%	63%	60%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	63%	62%	73%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	79%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	48%	53%	44%	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	20%	51%	-31%	58%	-38%
	2018	29%	50%	-21%	57%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	52%	-16%	58%	-22%
	2018	23%	49%	-26%	56%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	24%	50%	-26%	56%	-32%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	64%	-26%	64%	-26%
	2018	50%	60%	-10%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison	-10%					
05	2019	38%	57%	-19%	60%	-22%
	2018	52%	61%	-9%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
Cohort Comparison	-12%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	26%	49%	-23%	53%	-27%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison	-18%					
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	21	59	64	22	37	40					
ELL	28	38	32	42	44	41	25				
BLK	28	55	64	43	51	61	27				
HSP	36	41	38	49	58	58	27				
MUL	33	70		67	90						
WHT	38	60	80	54	51		38				
FRL	29	54	63	47	55	55	28				
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	17	24	27	23	67	67	27				
ELL	15	35	38	46	42	50					
BLK	31	38	41	47	53	50	41				
HSP	25	38		53	52						
MUL	45			73							
WHT	29	47	60	63	73	70	78				
FRL	29	41	49	52	59	54	51				

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	19	38	42	25	52		9				
ELL	14	54	55	44	65						
BLK	31	51	55	56	69	79	34				
HSP	36	50		64	78		59				
MUL	65			81							
WHT	39	56		60	78		50				
FRL	35	53	60	59	72	82	41				

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	47
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
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	65
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	57
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	48
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- A majority of our 5th grade students scored a level 1 in reading prior to entering the 5th grade. As a result many of our level 1 and some level 2 students did not perform well on the Science exam. One of our teachers was new to this content area as well.

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

Science- A majority of our 5th grade students scored a level 1 in reading prior to entering the 5th grade. As a result many of our level 1 and some level 2 students did not perform well on the Science exam. One of our teachers was new to this content area as well.

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.

Reading Proficiency- Many of our students struggle in the areas of comprehension and vocabulary.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile- Targeted small group instruction, that focused on standards remediation.

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

The number of students scoring level 1 on state assessments
The number of students with excessive absents

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Reading Gains
3. Reading and Math Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Math Proficiency
5. Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading Proficiency and Lowest Performing Quartile If we Improve the level of rigor and the implementation of targeted tier two instruction in the areas of reading through the use of LLI, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Freckle and Lexia 5 Core Reading, students will be adequately prepared for the Florida Standards Assessment thus raising our overall proficiency levels in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA/Reading Achievement- 40.0 ELA/Reading Gains- 55.0 ELA/Reading BQ Gains -60
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Green (fullwoodt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Coach will be used to ensure that teachers are properly trained on how to use the intervention programs. Reading Coach will also assist in the monitoring of tier two instruction and ensuring that the programs are being implemented with fidelity. The Reading Coach will also model for and support teachers as needed. The Reading Interventionists will assist in the implementation of these programs by providing small group instruction to our lowest performing students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading proficiency increased by two percentage points. We also experienced an increase in both learning and bottom quartile gains. As a school, we would like to make additional gains in both of these areas. Freckle/ Lexia Core 5 Reading Collaborative Planning DRA kits Computers/IPads FSA item specs Achievement Level Descriptors Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reading Coach and Interventionist provide teacher training on
administering a DRA and LLI Program
2. All Reading Teachers will be trained and Reading Mastery, Corrective
Reading. Lexia and Freckle and the programs will be implemented on a daily basis.
3. Administration and Reading Coach monitor the implementation of these
programs.
4. Teachers bring their small group plans and student work to Collaborative
Planning to determine student progress and next steps.
5. Administration and coaches will conduct classroom walk-throughs using
targeted observation form.

6. An additional printer and classroom supplies will be purchased to aid teachers in planning for instruction.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Proficiency and Lowest Performing Quartile If we actively target and maintain a focus on the students who regressed in math proficiency and/or learning gains, students will be better prepared to meet grade-level expectations and/or show growth the state assessment
Measurable Outcome:	FSA Math Proficiency - 57 FSA Math Gains - 66 FSA Math BQ Gains - 68
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Green (fullwoodt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math Coach will be used to ensure that teachers are properly trained on how to use the intervention programs. Math Coach will also assist in the monitoring of tier two instruction and ensuring that the programs are being implemented with fidelity. The Math Coach will also model for and support teachers as needed. The Math Interventionists will assist in the implementation of these programs by providing small group instruction to our lowest performing students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on 18-19 FSA Math results, we need to focus on small instructional groups, as well as individual learning paths to meet the needs of students who regressed in the math proficiency and/or learning gains. FSA Item Specifications FSA Math Achievement Level Descriptors Collaborative Planning Blended Learning Math Manipulatives Math Coach Math Interventionist iReady Math Toolkit Unify Acalectics

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide training on accessing grade level and classroom data through
Unify, Baseball Card and iReady.
2. During common planning, use data to target standards that need to be remediated.
3. Using the standards that will be re -mediated, we will choose lessons from
the iReady Toolbox that address these standards.
4. Provide training on the Acalectics Program and monitor its fidelity.
5. Use common planning to discuss different ways to promote student
accountability with blended learning tools.

6. An additional printer and classroom supplies will be purchased to aid teachers in planning for instruction.

Person Responsible   Michael Maxey (maxeym@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 5 Essentials survey, Safety was the lowest measure in the Supportive Environment category. It scored at 36 weak however, it did increase by 4 from the previous.
Measurable Outcome:	If Safety increases in students, then the Supportive Environment domain, will increase on the 2020-2021 5 Essentials survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Green (fullwoodt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with higher safety ratings tend to provide opportunities for students to feel safe and also voice their concerns.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If the school is able to provide an environment where students feel safe, students will be more focused on their academic learning.

Action Steps to Implement

• PBIS for all areas of the school
• Class of the Week
• Safety assemblies
• Monthly Drills (Different times of the day and different areas this year)
• Monthly Safety and referral updates with teachers
• Monthly PBIS meeting
• Quarterly PBIS Newsletters (teachers and parents)
• Students request individual counseling
• Teacher counseling referrals
• Conduct focus group interviews with 4th and 5th grade students at the beginning of the 2nd and 4th grade students to view their perception of safety throughout the different areas of campus and among their peers, faculty, and staff. Safety ambassadors and restorative practice groups with students in 3rd – 5th.
• Through the PBIS Team create strategies/events/activities for students (dependent on student feedback from focus groups) that promote safety and teach students about safety around campus. Strategies are to include student suggestions from focus groups.

Person Responsible   Tiffany Green (fullwoodt@duvalschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on previous year Standards walkthrough data, less than 40 % (0.8 out of 2.0 on the dial) student learning tasks were aligned to the instructional delivery. We will focus on the learning ARC to ensure that learning task and assessments are aligned to the standard. Through full implementation of the learning ARC's , aligned task and assessments , student performance in all academic areas will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	All of Woodland Acres Elementary's current K-5 teachers will engage in successful standards based instructional planning and implementation of the learning ARC's during administratively led common planning and PLC's ensuring task and assessments met the full rigor and depth of the standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Green (fullwoodt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development will be done with teachers focused on standards-based tiered instruction. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the quality and fidelity of tiered instruction. Teachers will work with the admin team to create task that are aligned to the standards. Once the task are complete, admin will retain a copy of those task.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above strategies have been selected through the evidence presented in last year's SWT data. We will use the Standards Walkthrough Tool to measure classroom instruction, student task alignment and assessment alignment in core classes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilizing resources and reports from SWT data.
2. Frequent classroom walkthroughs using SWT.
3. Quarterly data chats with administration that will focus on student growth through the implementation of learning ARC, tasks and assessments. We will reflect on implementation and focus on tiered instruction.
4. All teachers will participate in monthly PD on the learning ARC's .
5. Instructional Focus walks with partner teachers.
6. Use the student work protocol to analyze student work and assessment to ensure that tasks and assessments are aligned to the standard.

Person Responsible	Tiffany Green (fullwoodt@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All of the areas of concern have been addressed.

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.

Woodland Acres Elementary has many partnerships throughout the community of Jacksonville. Currently, the school is partnered with three faith-based partners - Destination Church and Impact Church.
Destination Church provides many needs for our students to support the well-being of the child as well as academic success. Destination Church has provided clothes for students that need them throughout the school day. They also hold a coat drive in the winter for students that do not have protection from the cold temperatures. The church provided holiday gifts for students in December.
Impact Church has agreed to partner with Woodland Acres Elementary to participate in a mentoring program with our most at-risk students. They will participate in a weekly "Power Lunch" which pairs a church member with a student to have conversations and promote the love a reading. Impact Church also provided school supplies for students at the beginning of the school year.
Blessings in a Backpack has also partnered with Woodland Acres this year. This program will provide 200 meals per week to some of our most neediest students, so that they will have food to eat over the weekend.
Woodland Acres Elementary School is also a Professional Development School for the University of North Florida. This partnership provides many opportunities for teacher and student growth. UNF students complete field experiences, course work, and internships at Woodland Acres Elementary. Through these programs, Woodland Acres students are provided tutoring and tiered interventions.
The UNF partnership also brought the business partnership of Main Street America, Inc. to Woodland Acres Elementary. The partnership with MSA has resulted in a supply drive, monthly tutoring, a book drive, and 5th grade field trip to their business headquarters.

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: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00