Duval County Public Schools

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

1709 LANSDOWNE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/parkwood

Demographics

Principal: Ashton Price J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (45%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

1709 LANSDOWNE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/parkwood

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 KG-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	81%

School Grades History

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

In collaboration with family and community the mission of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to provide an academically rigorous learning experience in a safe environment for all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to do what is best for children as we develop competent independent learners who are eager to explore the possibilities of what they can become.

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
Price, Ashton	Principal	Responsible for all aspects of school operation.
Rivers, Marshana	Assistant Principal	Test Coordinator, data mining and assists in instructional planning.
Clark, Amy	Instructional Coach	Responsible for aspects of Reading and helps with the coaching of best practices in the area of reading.
Sapp, Demetrice	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ashton Price J

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
19

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (45%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	48	45	44	44	65	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	0	16	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	30	0	40	33	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	32	0	41	36	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	26	39	32	29	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	15	8	24	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	21	44	30	60	39	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228

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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	15	8	24	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	21	44	30	60	39	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228

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	

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	37%	50%	57%	46%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	56%	58%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	62%	63%	45%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	63%	62%	60%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	47%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	48%	53%	36%	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	42%	51%	-9%	58%	-16%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
	2018	35%	49%	-14%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	26%	50%	-24%	56%	-30%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison	-28%					
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	13	22	29	24	37	29					
ELL	17			56							
BLK	33	43	38	48	58	40	30				
HSP	38			69							
WHT	49	65		51	50						
FRL	31	42	46	41	47	40	21				
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	16	31		31	71						
ELL	30			40							
BLK	33	38	47	47	65	63	50				
HSP	57			50							
WHT	57	56		83	89		87				
FRL	38	40	47	54	69	63	62				
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	29		19	57						
BLK	41	58	47	39	59	57	27				
HSP	59			31							
WHT	57	58		60	69		56				
FRL	40	53	50	37	57	46	27				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	96
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	
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	49
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	54
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	
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	54
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.

Parkwood Heights Elementary on the 2019 state assessment lost 27 points in the area of Science. This lost was due to our inability to get students to master the tested standards. Instructor spent too much time reviewing standards that should have been mastered in previous grades.

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

Parkwood Heights Elementary on the 2019 state assessment lost 27 points in the area of Science. This lost was due to our inability to get students to master the tested standards. Instructor spent too much time reviewing standards that should have been mastered in previous grades.

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 data shows that 5th graders on the 2019 state assessment on the Reading FSA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

ELA learning gains showed the largest improvement with a 2% increase on the 2019 state assessment. There were no new actions that took place. constantly trying to give our student equivalent experiences of the type of rigor they will have during assessments.

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

Early Warning System data from 2018-2019 indicates that 78 out 342 students had attendance below 90
percent.

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

1. Increase Reading Proficiency
2. Increase Math Proficiency
3. Increase Science Proficiency
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2019 state assessment for reading the level of proficiency decrease in the area of Reading by 3% point and lowest performing quartile also decreased by 4 percentage points. Because of the global pandemic students have been out of school. It is important that research based strategies are used to address students mastery of grade-level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	To improve instructional delivery of 80% of our faculty when providing reading instruction; through a researched based program.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of Corrective Reading with fidelity in grades 3rd -5th. Teachers who teach grades K-2 students will use the Reading Mastery Program. Teachers will utilize mastery checks along the way to determine students progression.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery will be used to address fluency and reading comprehension for students in grades 3-5. This program has proven to remediate and advance students ability to read and comprehend on grade level.

Action Steps to Implement	

All teachers responsible for Reading instruction will have training based on their grade level and intervention program used before instructing students.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Admin. will use classroom observations of best practices and student data to determine next steps.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Admin will meet weekly with all teachers of reading to analyze data and determine next steps for professional development.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Admin will weekly check the pacing of lessons completed to ensure program completion by the end of school year.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Reading Interventionist will assist the classroom teachers in developing and implementing reading lessons designed to remediate deficiencies. In addition the reading interventionist will develop a schedule to work with lower performing quartile in Reading.

Person Responsible	Amy Clark (mymulneix@yahoo.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data from the last administration of the state assessment showed a 5 percentage point decrease from the previous year. The use of Acaletics program with fidelity has been proven to increase student achievement in the area of mathematics. All teachers in 2nd - 5th grade will use the program to improve mathematical fluency.
Measurable Outcome:	To improve fluency and mathematical concepts through daily practice. Students will take an assessment monthly to determine their progress. In addition students will also take the state assessment in mathematics and will show a 10 percentage point increase over their previous score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of this program will allow us to extend exposure to concepts and skills as well as multi-domain exposure to concepts and skills within the designated class period.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The unique combination of content focused materials that are fully aligned with the more rigorous state standards, data driven instructional best practices, a system of assessment and accountability and ongoing formal and informal professional development.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students scheduled correctly to receive program in 2nd-5th grade.
2. Implement program with fidelity.
3. Monthly scrimmages for students.
4. Monthly individual data review of students mastery of grade-level standards.
5. Monthly teachers receives ongoing professional development.

Person Responsible   Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The use of Acaletics (Science) program with fidelity has been proven to increase student achievement in the area of science.
Measurable Outcome:	To improve student mastery of scientific concepts through daily instruction and monthly assessments that will improve their mastery of standards. This cohort of students should attain at least 50% proficiency at the administration of the state assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marshana Rivers (bushm2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of this program will allow us to extend exposure to concepts and skills as well as multi-domain exposure to concepts and skills within the designated class period. In addition the implementation of the Acaletics (Science) permits students to take academic risks and assists the teacher in identifying misconceptions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The unique combination of content focused materials that are fully aligned with the more rigorous state standards, data driven instructional best practices, a system of assessment and accountability and ongoing formal and informal professional development.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students scheduled correctly to receive program in 2nd-5th grade.
2. Implement program with fidelity.
3. Monthly scrimmages for students.
4. Monthly individual data review of students mastery of grade-level standards.
5. Monthly teachers receives ongoing professional development.

Person Responsible Marshana Rivers (bushm2@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The increasing number of ELL's and parents that are having difficulty navigating the education landscape.
Measurable Outcome:	If families cultural diversities are recognized then we will create a safe and civil school that fosters student growth and development.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marshana Rivers (bushm2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The increasing number of ELL's and the needs of their families to adjust to American educational system has made a Parent Liaison a needed resource. As families continue to recover from the recent pandemic the ability to provide resources that will assist them in the recovery efforts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent Liaisons create a bridge between schools and families and encourages parental involvement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development for all staff on MTSS system and resources for assisting students social and emotional needs.
2. Ongoing progress meetings for MTSS.
3. Parent Liaison will assist in scheduling and implementing data chats with parents and support their students academic needs.

Person Responsible	Marshana Rivers (bushm2@duvalschools.org)

4. Secure student classroom supplies in house so that families may use materials without fear of financial obligations.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Parkwood Heights Elementary will focus on assessing students' learning through aligned formal and informal assessments. Last year while using the standards walk-thru tool Parkwood had 2.6 on Assessing student Learning and .6 in determining mastery on grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	75% Parkwood Heights teachers will engage in appropriate aligned standards based informal and formal assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the Standards based walkthru tool admin can determine the classrooms that have aligned formal and informal assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Previously when analyzing data; some of the data presented indicated that students were on grade level when they were not. The assessment and state standard were not aligned which allows for a false positive.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development on how to align assessments and state standards.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Conduct grade level meetings, unpack standards and develop assessments that are aligned to the standard before designing lessons.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Conduct standards based walk-thru focusing on assessment alignment. Then discuss and plan for remediation during common planning times.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Professional Development on the use of Learning Arcs

Person Responsible	Marshana Rivers (bushm2@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will participate in Instructional Rounds using the Standards Walk-thru tool focusing on standards alignment to assessment.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An analysis of the 5 Essentials data from the 2019-2020 school year indicated that staff was neutral 33% in the area of collaborative planning. Collaborative planning allows several teachers to work together to share best practices, identify misconceptions and potential barriers to learning.
Measurable Outcome:	75% of teachers surveyed will indicate that collaborative planning is a strength at Parkwood Heights Elementary.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Parkwood Heights will use paraprofessionals to cover classrooms so that the teacher can observe and critique other teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected because of documented growth of improved instructions.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 meet weekly to discuss student attendance and discuss interventions for students that are absent for more than 5 days in a 30 day period.

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.

Parkwood Heights Elementary builds and sustains positive relationships with local community by making sure
that they are a active part of our school community. We are always looking for opportunities to help a business by giving them our student work to display or having a spirit night at their business. We also invite our community partners to participate in our school activities.

As our local community begins to recover we will invite them to participate in our virtual meetings. This will provide them an opportunity to be apart of our virtual community until we are safe to host face-to-face meetings.

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: Instructional Practice: Science**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**	$0.00
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	$0.00
6	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**