Duval County Public Schools

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

3276 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/jwjohnson

Demographics

Principal: James Stuckey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	47%
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: A (78%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (77%)
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

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

3276 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/jwjohnson

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	27%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of James Weldon Johnson College Prep is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At James Weldon Johnson College Prep, we are empowering students to contribute to a global society by fostering a rich academic experience, a gratefulness for history, a heart for community, and an appreciation for a diverse culture.

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
Kniseley, John	Principal	
Chambers, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Dukes, Berreath	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/6/2020, James Stuckey

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.*
1

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

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)	47%
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: A (78%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (77%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	354	344	337	0	0	0	0	1035
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	352	340	304	0	0	0	0	996
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	12	13	10	0	0	0	0	35

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	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	9

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	352	340	304	0	0	0	0	996
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	12	13	10	0	0	0	0	35

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	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	9

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	84%	43%	54%	84%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	49%	54%	70%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	45%	47%	64%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	89%	49%	58%	91%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	66%	50%	57%	69%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	47%	51%	68%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	86%	44%	51%	86%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	68%	72%	96%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	83%	47%	36%	54%	29%
	2018	80%	44%	36%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	83%	44%	39%	52%	31%
	2018	81%	41%	40%	51%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	87%	49%	38%	56%	31%
	2018	91%	51%	40%	58%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	88%	51%	37%	55%	33%
	2018	79%	42%	37%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	87%	47%	40%	54%	33%
	2018	95%	50%	45%	54%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018	100%	31%	69%	45%	55%
Same Grade Comparison		-100%				
Cohort Comparison		-95%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	61%	40%	21%	48%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	85%	44%	41%	50%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	67%	29%	67%	29%
2018	96%	63%	33%	65%	31%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	69%	23%	71%	21%
2018	96%	84%	12%	71%	25%
Compare		-4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	57%	32%	61%	28%
2018	91%	61%	30%	62%	29%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	100%	57%	43%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	56	55	47	64	67	52	64	76	75		

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
ELL	71	78		88	72			100			
ASN	94	78	73	98	82	69	97	96	97		
BLK	71	59	59	79	57	56	71	86	85		
HSP	85	61	55	92	64		94	95	95		
MUL	93	74		95	79		82	96	94		
WHT	92	71	60	93	65	63	94	96	93		
FRL	71	62	54	80	61	61	78	84	87		

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	78	58		74	54	60					
ELL	67	50		92	83						
ASN	93	78	62	98	83	79	94	100	97		
BLK	71	59	57	80	64	62	75	92	85		
HSP	90	73	82	94	69	62	88	100	95		
MUL	91	70		93	75		100	92	100		
WHT	91	70	69	96	76	81	90	97	98		
FRL	73	60	56	83	65	65	80	93	89		

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	76	65		90	55				100		
ASN	96	82	77	96	84	71	94	98	98		
BLK	70	61	61	82	60	66	73	94	83		
HSP	86	57	50	96	66	62	87	93	96		
MUL	95	78		92	68		100		100		
WHT	89	70	66	96	69	77	91	95	96		
FRL	70	56	59	84	59	63	73	92	87		

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	78
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	699
Total Components for the Federal Index	9

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
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	82
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	87
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	69
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	80
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	88
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	81
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	71
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.

Grade 8 Science showed the lowest performance at sixty-one percent. This was a huge loss from the previous years proficiency of eighty-five percent; a twenty-four point loss. Mainly students who were less than proficient in Ela to the 8th-grade science exam.

Math Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile Gains, as a whole, showed the lowest performance. Math Learning Gains decreased from seventy-three percent to sixty-six percent with a seven point loss from the previous year. Math Bottom Quartile Gains decreased from sixty-eight percent to sixty percent with an eight point loss from the previous year.

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

We are above the state and district average in all areas.

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.

Grade 6 ELA improved from the previous year with a gain of three percentage points. Grade 7 ELA improved from the previous year with a gain of two percentage points.

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

Grade 6 ELA improved from the previous year with a gain of three percentage points. Grade 7 ELA improved from the previous year with a gain of two percentage points.

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

One area concern is students attendance decreasing which will impact their academic progress towards mastery of standards and proficiency on state assessments.

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

1. Standards Based Instruction
2. Teacher Collaboration
3. Behavior
4. Professional Development
5. Data Analysis

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 513 standard walks last year, It was observed that instruction, tasks, and assessments were aligned to standards less than 50% of the time. In reviewing the 5-Essentials Survey from 2020, it was noted that most students responded that classes really made them think or were challenging which indicated most were experiencing the negative effect of the Opportunity Myth.
Measurable Outcome:	We will observe through our Standards Walks that instruction, tasks, and assessments are aligned to standards more than 75% of the time by January on the SW dials.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In PLC's, teachers will work collaboratively to develop common lessons, tasks, and assessments aligned to standards. The expectation is that each PLC submits their weekly meeting notes and admin will review lesson plans. These plans can be reviewed during Standards Walks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers are holding each other accountable within their common courses to develop lessons, tasks, and assessments that are aligned to standards. They should be using the District Curriculum Guides and aligned resources.

Action Steps to Implement

Make sure we have regularly scheduled and published PLC times.

Person Responsible	Berreath Dukes (dukesb@duvalschools.org)

Use protocols during staff PD to develop highly effective PLC's (Forming, Norming, Storming, Performing)

Person Responsible	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

Admin will monitor the PLC's according to their assigned departments. Each admin will review the PLC notes and will respond to any requests or concerns. Additionally, admin will conduct weekly Standards Walks and will provide timely feedback to teachers when appropriate.

Person Responsible	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

As a new admin team, we need to calibrate our Standard Walks and meet weekly to discuss our observations in order to consistently provide feedback to staff.

Person Responsible	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In schools with a Supportive Environment, the school is safe, demanding, and supportive. In such schools: students feel safe in and around the school. According to the 5-Essentials Survey, the lowest performance score was 'Very Weak' for the measure of Safety.
Measurable Outcome:	Would like to see the measure of Safety under the Essential Category of Supportive Environment increase to performance score of 'Neutral' on the 20-21 5-Essential Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Chambers (sullivanm2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To make sure all students and staff understand the protocols of what to do during Fire Drills, Code Red and Code Yellow.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on observations, student/parent concerns, and teacher feedback, there was a level of concern about the safety and security with regards to the reaction to various emergency situations last year.

Action Steps to Implement

To make sure all staff are trained and understand their expectations of all possible scenarios regarding fire drills, Code Yellow, and Code Red. This can be done at pre-planning.

Person Responsible	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

Make sure students are taught what to do during fire drills, Code Yellow, and Code Red. They should watch any district provided training videos.

Person Responsible	Michelle Chambers (sullivanm2@duvalschools.org)

Implement school-wide strategies to build positive relationships with all students to help foster a positive and supportive environment.

Person Responsible	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

Conduct monthly scheduled Emergency Preparedness drills to give students and staff opportunities to train and learn.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	James Weldon Johnson MS received a measured score of Neutral in the category, Effective Leader, The lowest measure in the category was Teacher-Principal Trust which was Weak. In schools with Effective Leaders, principals and teachers work together to implement a shared vision. In such schools, people, programs, and resources are focused on a vision for sustained improvement. Leaders: practice shared leadership, set high goals for quality instruction, maintain mutually trusting and respectful relationships, support professional advancement for faculty and staff, and manage resources for sustained program improvement
Measurable Outcome:	One measurable outcome would be to see the measured score for Effective Leader increase to Strong as reflected on the 2021 5-Essentials Survey. By establishing an effective Instructional Leadership Team, we should see teachers working together to implement and foster a shared vision.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Establish an effective Instructional Leadership Team that focuses all school resources in support of sustained school-wide improvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing an effective Instructional Leadership Team helps create and sustain systems that sustain school-wide improvement and empowers teachers and increases their status in the school.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish a Instructional Leadership Team with representation from each content areas. The teachers will be voted on by their individual departments.

Person Responsible	John Kniseley (kniseleyj@duvalschools.org)

Establish norms and best practices for the ILT. We need to establish protocols and a decision making matrix that is aligned with the SIP.

Person Responsible	Berreath Dukes (dukesb@duvalschools.org)

Create a meeting calendar and system to report out communication school-wide and thru individual departments.

Person Responsible	Michelle Chambers (sullivanm2@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The remaining priorities go hand in hand with our identified Areas of Focus. We will use data analysis to progress monitor our focus on Standards-aligned Instruction, how effectively our PLC's are functioning, and whether our students and staff believe the campus feels safer.

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.

My goal is to introduce SEL to the staff and eventually implement classes for 6th graders. In addition, there will be a focus on staff building positive relationships with students. This can be done through utilizing SEL and AVID Strategies. In addition, i am going to frequently meet with students and staff to assess the culture and climate and ask for feedback and suggestions. If students feel included, their will be more ownership.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00