

Duval County Public Schools

Alfred I. Dupont Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Alfred I. Dupont Middle School

2710 DUPONT AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32217

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

Demographics

Principal: Marilyn Barnwell M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Alfred I. Dupont Middle School

2710 DUPONT AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32217

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

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	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	84%

School Grades History

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

Our mission is to create a learning community promoting the acquisition of skills which empower students to fully participate in a complex global marketplace.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will advance from duPont Middle School to high school with the skills necessary for academic and personal success.

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
Barnwell, Marilyn	Principal	Implement and monitor all school-wide programs including Title I.
Bilgili, Ebru	Assistant Principal	
Mullen, Bibigul	Assistant Principal	
Shells , Jerrime	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2020, Marilyn Barnwell M

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
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	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 7/30/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	280	306	0	0	0	0	877	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	28	31	0	0	0	0	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	94	97	0	0	0	0	265	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	243	253	222	0	0	0	0	718	

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	199	197	169	0	0	0	0	565	

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	106	166	223	0	0	0	0	495
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	258	263	0	0	0	0	753

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	291	280	306	0	0	0	0	877
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	28	31	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	94	97	0	0	0	0	265
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	243	253	222	0	0	0	0	718

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	199	197	169	0	0	0	0	565

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	106	166	223	0	0	0	0	495
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	258	263	0	0	0	0	753

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	30%	43%	54%	32%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	49%	54%	46%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	47%	38%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	41%	49%	58%	31%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	47%	50%	57%	44%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	51%	42%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	35%	44%	51%	34%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	68%	72%	58%	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	25%	47%	-22%	54%	-29%
	2018	24%	44%	-20%	52%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	24%	44%	-20%	52%	-28%
	2018	29%	41%	-12%	51%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	34%	49%	-15%	56%	-22%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	29%	51%	-22%	55%	-26%
	2018	28%	42%	-14%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	47%	-7%	54%	-14%
	2018	29%	50%	-21%	54%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	30%	32%	-2%	46%	-16%
	2018	35%	31%	4%	45%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	17%	40%	-23%	48%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	23%	44%	-21%	50%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	67%	9%	67%	9%
2018	80%	63%	17%	65%	15%
Compare		-4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	69%	-13%	71%	-15%
2018	93%	84%	9%	71%	22%
Compare		-37%			
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	63%	57%	6%	61%	2%
2018	75%	61%	14%	62%	13%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	61%	10%	57%	14%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Compare		71%			

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	8	36	40	16	40	37	10	33			

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	14	38	42	33	43	42	22	40	56		
ASN	29	45	42	53	58	60	38	67			
BLK	26	40	42	31	44	40	22	55	61		
HSP	27	42	44	47	48	41	37	54	67		
MUL	45	48		42	36	10		83	73		
WHT	41	57	45	49	53	46	53	70	71		
FRL	29	44	45	39	46	42	33	62	69		
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	14	37	35	26	42	27	23				
ELL	15	39	35	28	51	38	25	80	36		
ASN	28	45	43	40	53	45	13				
BLK	30	40	36	31	45	40	31	100	61		
HSP	30	47	44	38	53	35	46	85	65		
MUL	57	59		61	54		50		60		
WHT	40	44	14	51	47	32	47	100	74		
FRL	32	44	37	37	49	38	36	96	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	12	28	26	11	29	28	8	30			
ELL	10	39	33	21	44	41	13	38			
ASN	27	48	42	42	52	44	36	36	67		
BLK	27	40	40	23	40	47	26	61	44		
HSP	28	49	33	29	45	42	37	63	44		
MUL	38	57		41	64			64			
WHT	48	53	38	42	44	17	48	48	57		
FRL	29	44	35	29	45	44	31	57	53		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	48
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest area of performance is Science which shows 17% proficiency. The overall score reflects the Biology proficiency rate which boosted the Science score to 35%.

Students are not performing well on the Comprehensive Science 3 assessment due to their low reading levels and difficulty retaining information from Comprehensive Science 1 and 2 which is necessary for mastery on the assessment.

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

Social Studies (Civics) showed the biggest decline from the previous year. Many students enrolled in Civics experience difficulty with reading complex texts and had a lower average lexile than the previous year's students.

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 greatest gap is in reading proficiency. Our school has a large ELL population and many students are now exiting the two year developmental reading and English Language Arts sheltered program

and are not be ready to grapple with the complex texts and grade level standards. Our ELL students showed 67% proficiency on the WIDA assessment and are making overall learning gains.

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

The greatest improvement was with the lowest performing quartile in reading which showed 7% growth from the previous year. We provided more intervention services through small-group pull out sessions versus previous years when we implemented small group within the classroom setting.

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

Out of School Suspensions rates were high (29% as measured against the whole school population). We have purchased an additional Dean of Students to help provide more intervention services and Restorative Justice opportunities to our students.

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

1. Focus on standards based instruction and assessment
2. Create and develop a culturally responsive classrooms
3. Establish school-wide norms that promote collective accountability
4. Develop teacher capacity in standards based instruction through consistent and relevant PLC
5. Engage the learning community through meaningful opportunities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Aligned observations (the observed instruction, tasks, and assessments that are aligned to grade-level standards) is the area of focus for our learning community. Data from the 2019-2020 standards-based walkthroughs, showed that although teachers were provided professional development and observational feedback on how to plan and deliver standards-based instruction, they still lacked a thorough understanding of every component required for student mastery.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will submit their completed standards walkthrough template (SWT) after each common planning session. We will utilize aligned tasks and common assessment data as well as the submitted SWT documents to measure specific outcomes. Administrators will follow up with teachers on their submitted documents and discuss walkthrough trend data as collected via the standards walkthrough tool. Our goal is to reach good on the standards-based school continuum by mid-year and strong by end of year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marilyn Barnwell (barnwellm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The standards walkthrough tool will be used in all classroom observations to capture the alignment of tasks and assessments to the standards for all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The standards walkthrough tool ensures that both calibration and consistent implementation and monitoring of standards-based instructional practices are evident. Utilization of the tool will show if lessons reach the demands, depth, and scope of standard and it provides evidence that students are exposed to and are able to master on grade-level requirements.

Action Steps to Implement

Retrain teachers on using the standards based analysis template and corresponding framework. Title I funds will be used to provide additional core subject area teachers (Science, Reading, and Foreign Language) for providing students with more individualized support and small group instruction. Title I funds will be used to purchase additional classroom supplies and materials for teacher/student use in improving student achievement. Title I funds will be utilized to fund 2 foreign language teachers who will provide comprehension strategies emphasized through the study of world language.

Person Responsible Marilyn Barnwell (barnwellm@duvalschools.org)

Allow opportunities through common planning for teachers to use the standards creation document and framework to create lessons, assessments, and aligned tasks. Teachers will have an opportunity to work on a problem of practice within their classrooms/content area.

Person Responsible Marilyn Barnwell (barnwellm@duvalschools.org)

The administrative team will engage in action learning focused on improving "aligned observations" using case studies, observations and student assessment data to develop culturally responsive instructional practices that align to standards - based instruction.

Person Responsible Marilyn Barnwell (barnwellm@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we establish school-wide norms that promote collective accountability then we will create a positive school culture. Improve school culture through both individual and collective accountability – sharing of data and best practices through dialogue, presentation and learning communities.

Measurable Outcome: School-wide suspension data will be monitored with a specific focus on students with disabilities and minority students. School Counselor contact logs will be monitored to identify the range of services needed/provided to students. Monitor restorative practice logs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marilyn Barnwell (barnwellm@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will implement a comprehensive Positive Behavior Intervention Program (PBIS) which will include input from faculty, staff, students, and parents. We will host a total of 8 Parent and Family Engagement activities to support our goal of creating a more supportive environment for all stakeholders.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Effective school-wide positive behavior plans have shown to reduce code of conduct violations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop Restorative Justice Program
2. Create PBIS plan.
3. Post school-wide behavior and academic expectations.
4. Conduct monthly review of discipline/academic data.
5. Engage parents through PTSA and School Advisory Council
6. Title I funds will be used to provide an additional dean position to promote student engagement in the classroom.

Person Responsible Marilyn Barnwell (barnwellm@duvalschools.org)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Improve teaching practices and academic discourse for equitable student outcomes through culturally responsive classroom practices embedded with an immediate and meaningful feedback cycle that aligns with rigorous standards- based instructional practices.

The process of providing systemic and ongoing feedback will help deepen standards-aligned instructional knowledge, skill and foster teacher efficacy. Creating a system that allows for consistent observations with actionable feedback to teachers will improve equitable classroom practices school wide.

Measurable Outcome: Outcomes will be measured using data from the standards walkthrough tool and observation data using the Danielson framework (Domains 1 and 3).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marilyn Barnwell (barnwellm@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Provide coaching and modeling for teachers through coaching cycle with opportunities for reflection and shift instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse students through aligned standards based instruction.

Create and utilize model classrooms and case study processes to help shift teacher perceptions on student learning and access to learning experiences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

As leadership team to improve knowledge, skill and efficacy in observing and conferring about equitable classroom practices school wide with teachers using a standards- based aligned instructional tools.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop teacher leadership profile through reflection and feedback
2. Action Learning Project in collaboration with UNF
3. Provide framework for problem of practice to be utilized throughout the year for reflection.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Through the standards-based walkthroughs, informal/formal observations, and implementation and monitoring of new PBIS protocols, we will analyze trends and initiate action steps for improvement.

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.

The school will continue to consider flexible meeting times and increase opportunities for parent involvement including but not limited to; Math, Science, and Literacy Night events as well as progress monitoring night. The school will continue to advertise events via School Messenger, Website, Marquee, and parent notices will be sent home with students.

Parents are encouraged to utilize the Parent Resource room to hold parent conferences and to get information on how to help their students adjust to middle school. Parents are told about the Parent Resource room at Orientation and Open House and can get directions to the room from the Main Office. Teachers are advised that the Parent Resource Room is available for parent conferences. Teachers are given this information during pre-planning.

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: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00