

Duval County Public Schools

# Greenland Pines Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Greenland Pines Elementary School

5050 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Michele Hinkley**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

## Greenland Pines Elementary School

5050 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	33%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

### School Grades History

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

Greenland Pines Elementary School's mission is to provide educational excellence at our school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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

Greenland Pines Elementary School's vision is a community working together to inspire and prepare all students for success in college or a career and in life.

### 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
Hinkley, Michelle	Principal	
Felts, Amber	Assistant Principal	
Ravula, Sruthika	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Michele Hinkley

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

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

59

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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



Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	
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**

Thursday 7/9/2020

**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	106	102	133	98	90	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	631	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	

**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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	106	102	133	98	90	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	631
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	65%	50%	57%	68%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	56%	58%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	39%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	62%	63%	72%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	48%	53%	66%	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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
	2018	63%	50%	13%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	74%	50%	24%	56%	18%
	2018	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
	2018	73%	59%	14%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
	2018	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	76%	57%	19%	60%	16%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
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	29	44	46	39	49	41	43				
ELL	50			58							
ASN	75	64		88	86		83				
BLK	49	50	36	53	53	45	38				
HSP	42	69		46	54						
MUL	57	47		71	60						
WHT	72	74	68	79	70	54	87				
FRL	54	67	57	57	56	40	58				
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	27	29	31	38	51	54	25				
ELL	35	43		35	50						
ASN	76	74		84	65		70				
BLK	48	48		62	50	70	60				
HSP	39	29		39	52	40	33				
MUL	60	65		67	71						
WHT	63	59	32	72	59	47	62				
FRL	46	51	33	57	56	51	54				
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	26	29	28	37	47	35	36				
ELL	38	58		56	55						
ASN	71	53		82	74						
BLK	61	57		55	52						
HSP	55	50		52	35						
MUL	67	69		74	54						
WHT	70	55	39	74	63	44	67				
FRL	56	51	44	63	54	23	48				

### 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	64
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
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	72
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	56
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.**

Our subgroup demonstrating the lowest performance is our Students with Disabilities at 29% proficiency in ELA. Students achievement increased from the prior year, yet still are demonstrating a slow pace of improvement. Our high number of SWD contribute to this low achievement average and we will continue to work with our teachers to provide supports for each student.

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

Our population section which had the greatest decline was our Lowest Performing Quartile Black students achieving Math Gains. The loss of the school's instructional coach was a factor for this decline. The lack of district content support also contributed to this loss.

**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 only component which was lower than the state average was our Lowest Performing Quartile in Math. The loss of the school's instructional coach was a factor for this decline. The lack of district content support also contributed to this loss.

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

The section of our data that demonstrated the most improvement was our White students performing at the Lowest Performing Quartile. We see this increase attributed to the work that was done within the grade levels in small groups and the focus by tutors in the ELA instruction.

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

One area which we will maintain close monitoring will be our math LPQ in 5th grade.

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

1. Math LPQ LG
2. ELA Achievement for SWD
3. Black student subgroup ELA LPQ LG
4. Facilitate opportunities to increase instructional leadership within the 5 Essentials Survey. (Effective Leaders domain)
5. Facilitate opportunities to increase collective responsibility within the 5 Essentials Survey. (Collaborative Teachers domain)

## 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 previous year standards walk-through data, less than 35% (0.7 of 2.0) of the student learning tasks were aligned to the instructional delivery. We will focus school-wide professional development and collaborative planning sessions around the learning ARC to ensure student learning tasks and assessments are aligned to the standard. Through full implementation of learning ARCs and aligned tasks student performance in all academic areas will increase.

**Measurable Outcome:** 100% of GPE K-5 teachers will engage in successful standards-based instructional, development and implementation of learning ARCs during administrative led common planning ensuring student tasks are aligned to the full rigor and depth of the standard. Through this work, the student task alignment on the SWT dashboard will increase 100% (by 0.7 to 1.4.)

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Professional development will be done with teachers focused on implementation of standards-based instruction and creation of learning ARCs. Weekly common planning will take place with all ELA and math teachers in K-5 to create learning ARCs and plan for aligned instruction, and learning tasks. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.

**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**

Utilize resources and reports from standards walk-through tool dashboard. Calibrate with AP and continue to use and share data frequently to ensure staff understanding and readiness. AP and principal will meet weekly and engage in conversation focused on evidence from the SWT and classroom observations to continue calibration throughout the year and discuss next steps.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Frequent classroom walk-throughs by principal and AP using SWT to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Quarterly teacher data chats with administration will focus on student growth through the implementation of the learning ARC, student tasks and aligned assessments. We will reflect on implementation in the classroom through focused evidence from walk-through data as well as student growth as shown through informal and formal data sets.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Engagement of all K-5 teachers in professional development based around standards-based instruction and creation of learning ARCs.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)



Analyze student work and assessment data during common planning sessions to ensure the tasks and assessments are aligned to the standard.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Implement Teaching Tuesday sessions monthly to allow teacher leaders to share evidence, resources, and possible action-steps for improving standards-based instruction within the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Admin will engage in weekly common planning with all K-5 teachers in the areas of ELA and/or math to create learning ARCs aligned to current instruction, create aligned student tasks and assessments and plan for implementation in all classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Provide teachers with quarterly TDE opportunities to work collaboratively to create learning ARCs, aligned tasks and assessments.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Implementation of monthly instructional walks with teachers and admin to focus specifically on focus board and student task alignment to instruction.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

**#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through the data from the 5 Essentials survey, instructional leadership was the lowest measure in the effective leaders domain. Instructional leadership scored at 25 and decreased 29 from the previous year.

**Measurable Outcome:** If instructional leadership increased in the building then the Effective Leaders domain (specifically the instructional leadership measure) will increase on the 2021 survey.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Schools with instructional leaders tend to view administrators as part of a collaborative team working toward a common goal.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When administrators and teachers work together toward a common goal, administrators are viewed more in the capacity of instructional leaders rather than just logistical supervisors.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Create a leadership team comprised of teachers and administrators to allow teachers to help facilitate the work and provide feedback and input.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Admin will meet weekly with teachers during common planning to plan together and continue to work towards successful standards-based instruction implementation.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Regular walk-throughs, quarterly data chats, frequent feedback and teacher-admin conversations about instruction will take place with both the principal and AP in all classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

**#3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through the data from the 5 Essentials survey, teacher-teacher trust was the lowest measure in the collaborative teachers domain. Instructional leadership scored at 9 and decreased 11 from the previous year.

**Measurable Outcome:** If instructional leadership increased in the building then the Collaborative Teachers domain (specifically the teacher-teacher trust measure) will increase on the 2021 survey.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Schools with higher culture and climate ratings tend to work efficiently to solve problems that may arise in the school including how to best serve students and families and how to support each other professionally through modeling of excellent instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If the school is able to have a solid teacher to teacher trust, they will more consistently be able to support each other and students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Develop a plan for team building activities.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Provide opportunities for relationship building and professional discourse regularly within the school.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate with one another in non-threatening environments. Implement Teaching Tuesday (led by teachers) to allow teachers opportunities to share ideas and resources that are having a positive impact on standards based instruction and student growth within their classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**These additional areas will be addressed through data chats, progress monitoring and common planning.**

**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.

It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, and responsibility. We will do this by providing opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through certain events such as Family Movie Nights, Family Dances, Math Night, Literacy Night, Student Conference night etc.. These events will also involve other stakeholders such as business partners as well as our faith-based partners.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.