

Duval County Public Schools

# Anchor Academy



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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Anchor Academy

555 WONDERWOOD DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

[www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy](http://www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy)

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Beale**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2020

<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)	29%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<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>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Anchor Academy

555 WONDERWOOD DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

[www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy](http://www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy)

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>19%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>48%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	B	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.**

To provide a positive, safe learning environment and educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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

Every student is inspired and prepared to be successful in college, 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
Beale-Collier, Jennifer	Principal	Responsible for Instructional and Cultural Levers within the school and oversees School Operations; monitors instruction with regularly scheduled walk-throughs and using the informal and formal components of the district's CAST system (based on the work Charlotte Danielson); leads and assists in coordinating and facilitating professional development for the staff, including job-embedded PD; serves as a member of the school's Shared Decision Making Team and the School Advisory Council.
Coffman, Carly	Assistant Principal	Responsible for Instructional Levers and student discipline; serves as the Testing Coordinator and Instructional Materials Manager; monitors instruction with regularly scheduled walk-throughs and using the informal and formal components of the district's CAST system; serves as a consultant for the School Advisory Council.
Keith, Eliese	School Counselor	Ms. Keith serves as the school's Guidance Counselor; provides classroom guidance and behavior support for struggling students; oversees the MRT, CPST, and AIT meetings; monitors instructional support for ESE students using the District's FOCUS program.
Maxwell, James	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Maxwell serves as a lead teacher on the 5th-grade Team and a content area expert in mathematics. He attends district meetings to learn more about new district initiatives and curricular expectations. He conducts professional development through serving as a model teacher within the school community, leading collaborative planning sessions, and providing professional development to others through early release training sessions and/or committee meetings.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Saturday 8/1/2020, Jennifer Beale

**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.*

13



**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.*

8

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

23

**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)	29%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<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>	TS&I
* 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	53	61	71	53	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	12	27	26	13	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	24	39	42	24	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149

**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	14	28	22	12	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

**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 7/21/2020

**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	58	53	71	62	46	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

**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 10 11 6 6 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 39

**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 0

Students retained two or more times 0 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 58 53 71 62 46 56 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 346

Attendance below 90 percent 0 1 0 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5

One or more suspensions 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

Course failure in ELA or Math 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Level 1 on statewide assessment 0 0 0 7 17 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 30

**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 10 11 6 6 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 39

**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 0

Students retained two or more times 0 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	66%	50%	57%	69%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	72%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	50%	53%	77%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	75%	62%	63%	70%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	62%	64%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	48%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	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	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
	2018	81%	50%	31%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2019	69%	50%	19%	56%	13%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
	2018	81%	59%	22%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	64%	8%	64%	8%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison				-1%		
Cohort Comparison				1%		

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	49%	22%	53%	18%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison				9%		
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	16	31	30	32	31	30	31				
BLK	67	61		70	67						
HSP	57	62		83	77						
MUL	50			64							
WHT	72	60	40	75	68	40	65				
FRL	60	39		67	65		56				
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	48	50		36	35	10	45				
BLK	55	41		73	53						
HSP	81	58		76	67						
MUL	87			67							
WHT	67	54	20	68	60	23	78				
FRL	60	43	21	65	50	15	50				
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	50	71	70	52	63						
BLK	53	73	70	55	57						
HSP	81	75		75	67						
MUL	91			91							
WHT	72	68	80	69	62	45	63				
FRL	58	65	75	63	52	27	65				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
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	70
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	57
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	60
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	57
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 data component which showed the lowest performance was our Students with Disabilities. One major contributing factor is that due to our large transient military student population our students who come from out of state, and out of the country do not stay with us from year to year. Thus their knowledge isn't maintained, and their scores often don't get counted.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our FRL Population. The factors that contributed to this decline were inconsistent reading intervention, lack of

transportation prevented students from receiving academic support in the form of After School Tutoring. Loss of instructional time due to low numbers school-wide, therefore having to adjust our schedule to accommodate, 3-Way Grade Level Splits.

**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 component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was our Students with Disabilities Population in the area of Reading Achievement. The state was 26%, and our SWD was 16%. The factor that contributed to this gap was due to our large transient military student population our students who come from out of state, and out of the country do not stay with us from year to year. Thus their knowledge isn't maintained, and their scores often don't get counted.

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

Math was the data component that showed the most improvement in all areas versus the District, and State data. This improvement can be attributed to our use of dedicated Math Interventionist who consistently supported, 5th-grade students through differentiated small group instruction based on individual needs.

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

Upon further reflection on EWS data, we found the following areas of concern were excessive absences, tardies, and early dismissals.

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

1. 1. Writing (K-5)
2. Reading Intervention
3. Math Intervention
4. PBIS/Attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Upon review of our Standards Walkthrough Dashboard data during the 2019-2020 school year, the lowest assessed category was Assessing Student Learning (specifically in the areas of "Determining Mastery" and "FSA Alignment") Although instructional standards are the key focus of the planning process and tasks and materials selected are to be aligned with what students are supposed to learn, the data is shows that work tasks and assessment opportunities intended to show students mastery of grade-level content may not always reflect the progression of the learning arc and/or FSA expectations as they relate to the targeted standard and/or state testing demands. Fidelity of Implementation of the Standards-Based Instruction Protocol school-wide with a focus on supporting grade level Content Area teachers in grades K-5 through the use of regularly scheduled Professional Learning Communities, and Common Planning.

**Measurable Outcome:** 90% of our Core Content teachers will be engaged in on-going Standards-Based planning fully implement the Standards-Based Protocol, and move from weak/moderate to strong on the SBI Continuum.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategy being implemented throughout the building for this Area of Focus will be the utilization of the Learning Arc and School-Based Continuum. via lesson plans, Formative and Informative Assessment Data, and PLC Meetings.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is based on our 2018-2019 FSA Reading and Math LPQ data, our Reading Intervention in grades 3-5 was identified as an area of focus, because our School-wide proficiency was 66% which was a 3 pt. decline from the previous year. After breaking down the data by grade level, we saw that additional support was needed in 4th grade due to only 60% of students being proficient, and only 44% of 4th graders made growth.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administrative PD of the Learning Arc with Sean Wigg 7/23/20

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

Administrative calibration and collaboration on the creation of Learning Arcs.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

PD for faculty on Opportunity Myth & Learning Arc formation, and implementation during Pre-planning.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

Calibrate the use of the Standards-Based Walkthrough Tool to determine where my Assistant Principal and I are on the School Continuum, to ensure we move from weak to strong.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

Hold weekly combination PLC's and Common Planning sessions with teachers to develop strategic lesson plans based on standards, and student data.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

Conduct monthly ED Professional Development.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

**#2. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our Areas of Focus are Effective Leadership, and Supportive Environment. The rationale is based on our "2020 5 Essentials Survey Report Data, which revealed that Teacher-Principal Trust and "Academic Personalism" were areas of critical need. When these relationships are fragile it directly impacts teacher "buy-in," efficacy as well as the student-teacher trust which can negatively affect student learning.

**Measurable Outcome:** We will increase in the areas of Supportive Environment and Teacher-Principal Trust from Weak to Strong.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Regularly scheduled Shared Decision Making Meetings. Focusing retention efforts on novice teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is, with the influence that teachers have over our lives, recognizing teacher accomplishments is a necessity. A good reward system helps a school build a growth-centered environment, track the individual progress of educators, and keep them inspired for dynamic growth and new achievements.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Monthly celebrations i.e., Birthday, DCPS Anniversaries, etc.
2. Teacher WOW, Awards: "Willingness over Why!" Awards
3. Admin. PD on Teacher Retention Strategies.

**Person Responsible** Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Writing (K-5)                  Because we noticed students could have been proficient if their writing points were higher. Due to the inconsistent writing practices and conferencing, the Writing achievement data is low in proficiency.                  Planning with the teacher based on assessment data from student writing samples from Writing City and Top Score writing prompts is essential to ensure consistency is occurring in the classroom daily.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Higher achievement, gains, and bottom quartile gains through a focus on writing daily, through the use of Writing City, and Top Score instructional materials.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Writing City in grades K-3 and Top Score in grades 4-5, will be used daily. Review student writing pieces, and provide feedback, and follow-up during bi-weekly Admin. Common Planning Meetings.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The rationale for selecting this strategy is because it is a District Mandated Curriculum. We are focusing on the fidelity of implementation in K-5.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Strengthening Literacy Development Across K-5 Content Areas;
2. Literacy Interventions for Struggling Readers and Writers;
3. Establish Structures and Culture for Supporting Literacy;
4. Building Leadership Capacity;
5. Supporting Teachers to Improve Instruction.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Reading Intervention  
 Reading Intervention in grades 3-5 was identified as an area of focus based on our 2018-2019 FSA Reading data. Our School-wide proficiency was 66% which was a 3 pt. decline from the previous year. After breaking down the data by grade level, we saw that additional support was needed in 4th grade due to only 64% of students being proficient, and only 44% of 4th graders made growth.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we increase instructional focus and intervention on Key Ideas/Details, Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, in grades 3-5, and writing in grades 4-5, then school-wide proficiency and overall bottom quartile gains will increase.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** ELA Teachers will use AR, LLI, and other Standards-Based/Research-Based Materials. To address the area of Writing support, we will use Writing City in 3rd grade, and Top Score in grades 4-5, with fidelity.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These Reading/Writing resources were selected by the District because of the lack of writing curriculum provided previously. Based on Writing Scores, the district realized the need for a comprehensive Writing Curriculum that teachers could use.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will bring student work samples to Admin. Common Planning and discuss their progress monitoring.
2. Admin. will conduct walkthroughs during the writing portion of the daily schedule and provide immediate feedback.
3. Every reading teacher in grade K-5 attended Reading and Writing Professional Development Training.
4. Teachers (K-5) will collaborate and participate in peer observations to present and breakdown standards across grade levels per content area.
5. Principal Collier will monitor Achieve 3000 - Lessons Passed and personally monitors student achievement. She will meet with them during lunchtime, and Celebrations for passing articles at 75% or higher will be held in the first week of the month for the previous month.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Math Intervention  
 Math Intervention in grades 3-5 was identified as a continued area of focus based on our 2018-2019 FSA Math data. Our School-wide proficiency: 77% (+6), Gains: 67% (+7), and Bottom Quartile Gains: 43% (+16) all increased from the previous year. After disaggregating the data by grade level, we saw that in order to continue this progress, intervention support must be maintained in 5th, and implemented with fidelity in 3rd, and 4th.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we increase instructional support on the identified areas of need i.e., Number and Operations in Base Ten & Measurement, Data, and Geometry in grades 3-5, and if we identify the foundational skills needed and provide systematic interventions for our 4th and 5th-grade LPQ students, we will increase our overall bottom quartile gains, gains, and school-wide proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Math Interventionists will use Duval Math and other Standards/Research-Based Materials to provide small-group instruction/remediation in grades 3-5 to identified LPQ students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We chose Duval Math and other Standards / Research-Based Materials to help Interventionists provide differentiated instructional support to identified students in grades 3-5.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. We strategically developed a targeted schedule aimed at providing instructional support to identified LPQ Students in 3-5.
2. Teachers bring student work to Admin. Common Planning and discuss their progress monitoring.
3. DODEA Anchor Grant funds to support after school tutoring and incentives
4. Teachers (K-5) will collaborate and participate in peer observations to present and breakdown standards across grade levels per content area.

**Person Responsible** Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** PBIS/Attendance  
 The Positive Behavior and Intervention Support (PBIS) document outlines the school's school-wide behavior system. At Finegan, we believe in giving each child the tools to succeed in life. We use teaching, modeling, and other appropriate strategies to maintain the positive behaviors necessary to ensure a safe, orderly, and productive learning environment. Teachers have been trained in the use of CHAMPs and strive to maintain a 5:1 ratio of interaction with students. Additionally, Restorative Justice is often implemented by both the AP and School Counselor when addressing Class I & II student disciplinary issues.

**Measurable Outcome:** We've also implemented a student wellness program involving the "highlighting of monthly character traits" on "WFIN." This program not only reminds our students of the character trait's meaning but also reinforces their ability to be a "H.E.R.O. Helpful, Encouraging, Responsible and Outstanding." This program reinforces our school's mission, "There's a H.E.R.O in everyone" and directly impacts and positively influences Finegan's climate and culture by increasing students' confidence and ownership of their behavior.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Anchor Program is a character-based incentive program for our students. Each month highlights a specific character trait which the teacher uses to select which students they feel most exemplifies that trait. If we implement a Character Trait Program, then we will increase students' personal accountability and positively impact the climate and culture of our school.

Attendance is monitored by the CRT/Records Clerk via FOCUS and Attendance Intervention Team (A.I.T) meetings are scheduled for identified students (as needed), based on district guidelines.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** At the first sign of any behavior issue, Finegan employs a positive behavior system that analyzes the behaviors' root causes and uses various resources and strategies to avert behavior that impairs learning. Such strategies and resources include: Restorative Justice, partnering with parents, teachers, School counselors, MFLC, Mental Health Therapist and Communities in Schools.

Per the Student Progression Plan, when a student's grade falls below a "C", written notification is sent home to inform parents of students' academic struggles. This notification will act as an early warning indicator of declining academic performance.

\*\*\*\*\*Criteria is still being researched in order to determine which students are being placed in our after school tutoring program that will be held twice per week.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Character Trait - Silver & Golden Anchor Awards Program
2. The school counselor works with students both through classroom guidance, in small group and one-on-one interactions. She is also involved in the behavior support aspect of the school discipline process.
3. Since almost 80% of Finegan's students are from military families, the school has two Military and Family Life Counselors (MFLC) to address the unique challenges faced by those families. Sponsored by the Department of Defense, the program offers private and confidential non-medical counseling to Servicemembers' families, children, and staff.
4. As a result of being awarded a DODEA "Anchor Grant," which ends May 2020, we've received a Mental

Health Therapist who provides private and confidential mental health counseling services, and support to both our "Military" and "Non-Military" students and their families.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**All schoolwide improvement priorities identified earlier in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/Analysis were addressed in the previous sections.**

## 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.

In order to develop a positive school culture and environment at JBE, stakeholders are routinely engaged in providing feedback at the school level and creating internal and external school improvement goals addressing this area of focus. During the 2019-2020 school year, faculty/staff, students, and parents were highly encouraged to complete the 5Essentials Survey. The nature of this survey provided them with an opportunity to express their feedback concerning various domains involved in the operation of the school confidentially. Teachers provided feedback related to

the categories of Ambitious Instruction, Effective Leaders, Collaborative Teachers, and Involved Families. Students provided feedback related to the categories of Ambitious Instruction and Supportive Environment. Parents provided feedback related to the categories of Communication Preferences, Computer-Internet Access, Parent Connectedness, Parent Involvement & Disruptions, Parent Satisfaction, Parent-Student Interaction, Parent-Teacher Interaction, Parents' Assessment of Involvement in School, Parent's Assessment of School Safety, Parents' Assessment of Teacher Trust, Quality of School Facilities, and School Outreach. When these data points are collected from the various stakeholder groups, review and analysis of this information are conducted through multiple forums, including Leadership Team, Shared Decision-Making Team, SAC, and PTO meetings. This enabled stakeholders to interpret the meaning of the data results and determine the next steps for improvement associated with making the school culture and environment more positive moving forward.

During each school year, the SAC Committee meets at least 8 times per year on a monthly basis to engage

stakeholders in the process of school improvement. One of the topics continually addressed is the school culture, so various representative groups are able to provide the administration with direct feedback and determine actionable next steps to improve in this area. Each year, the Principal holds monthly Coffee with the Principal with parents as a way to communicate with parents. JFE also holds Threat Assessment Team meetings on a monthly basis to review current behavioral data (i.e. number of referrals, the severity of violations). In 2020-2021, the PBIS Committee will create an annual PBIS Plan to guide how JFE faculty/staff members encourage and reinforce positive behaviors from all students. The JFE Leadership Team is also active in promoting a positive school culture and learning environment by developing ways in which faculty/staff members can be recognized for their personal and professional achievements.

**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.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Leadership: Teacher Recruitment and Retention</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
3	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
4	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$2,644.75</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2471 - Anchor Academy			\$2,644.75
			<i>Notes: Accelerated Reader is a program paid for by our School funds and not District Funds</i>			
5	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
6	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports</b>				<b>\$1,585.80</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2763		2471 - Anchor Academy	Other		\$1,196.80
			<i>Notes: Character Education Program - Silver &amp; Golden Anchor Shirts for students.</i>			
	2763		2471 - Anchor Academy	Other		\$389.00
			<i>Notes: Silver and Golden Anchor Award Ribbons</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$4,230.55</b>