

Duval County Public Schools

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

8801 LAKE PLACID DR E, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Willis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (32%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (32%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

8801 LAKE PLACID DR E, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	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	99%

School Grades History

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

Martin Luther King Jr. F.A.M.E. Academy will provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary, every student is inspired and prepared for success in middle school and beyond.

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
Gentry, Cindy	Principal	Recruitment, retention, evaluation, and development of instructional and school staff; Monitors and evaluates the instructional program; Establishes instructional targets and monitors progress towards goals; Ensures a positive, safe school environment for students, faculty, and staff; Engages parents and community members in the instructional program.
Payne, Marva	School Counselor	Supports the emotional and mental well-being of students through classroom guidance and small/individual counseling; leads the work of the Multi-disciplinary Referral Team
Willis, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Supports/assists the principal with the following: Recruitment, retention, evaluation, and development of instructional and school staff; Monitors and evaluates the instructional program; Establishes instructional targets and monitors progress towards goals; Ensures a positive, safe school environment for students, faculty, and staff; Engages parents and community members in the instructional program.
Douglas, Lamnette	Instructional Coach	Provides support for teachers through coaching and professional learning
Telfair, Henrietta	Teacher, K-12	Provides Tier 3 interventions instruction for struggling readers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Andrea Willis

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

1

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

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (32%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (32%)
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	53	66	60	43	64	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348
Attendance below 90 percent	25	15	18	27	22	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	6	19	35	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

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	63	41	65	70	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	16	21	16	10	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	2	8	5	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	220	47	24	44	57	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446

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	12	34	20	26	50	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	63	41	65	70	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	16	21	16	10	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	2	8	5	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	220	47	24	44	57	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446

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	12	34	20	26	50	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	23%	50%	57%	24%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	34%	56%	58%	47%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	53%	53%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	48%	62%	63%	39%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	63%	62%	53%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	51%	54%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	22%	48%	53%	38%	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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
	2018	26%	50%	-24%	57%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	19%	52%	-33%	58%	-39%
	2018	19%	49%	-30%	56%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	19%	50%	-31%	56%	-37%
	2018	28%	51%	-23%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	61%	7%	62%	6%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	64%	-32%	64%	-32%
	2018	18%	60%	-42%	62%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	61%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
	2018	29%	56%	-27%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	6	28	28	17	56	71					
BLK	22	32	39	47	55	62	19				
FRL	22	32	38	46	55	62	17				
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	3	20	21	8	26	29					
BLK	23	31	29	33	46	39	29				
FRL	19	30	27	30	45	38	23				
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	19	19	20	42	31	29				
BLK	23	48	53	37	53	54	36				
FRL	22	45	52	38	56	53	35				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	288
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	2
English Language Learners	
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
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	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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Science proficiency was the data component with the lowest performance at 22% of fifth grade students scoring 3 or higher. Performance can be attributed to our students' poor reading skills and ability to comprehend grade level texts.

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

The only data component with a decline was Science Proficiency.

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 ELA proficiency of our fourth grade students is the data component with the largest gap when compared to the state average. This gap can be contributed to a lack of consistent, high-quality, standards-based instruction due to a teacher vacancy.

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

The math learning gains of the lowest performing quartile is the area that showed the most improvement. The implementation of Acaletics during a dedicated intervention block contributed to the increase, as well as, focused and specific small group instruction for LPQ students each day with the Math Coach or Principal.

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

Poor attendance and the number of students who scored in the lowest achievement level on FSA are both areas of concern.

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

1. Increasing the ELA Proficiency of all students and subgroups
2. Decreasing the number of students with attendance below 90 percent
3. Improve students' perception of their emotional and physical safety and in school
4. Improve the capacity of teachers to provide high-quality instruction for economically disadvantaged students
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on data from the Standards Walk-through Instrument, only 50% of classroom observations with fully implemented standards-based instruction, including materials, assessments, and instruction were observed. By providing standards aligned instruction and assessments, the opportunity for students to master grade-level standards will increase, thereby increasing the probability that students will be prepared for the next grade level, college, and career.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the year, 100% of classrooms will implement standards-aligned instruction, materials, and assessments in the core subject areas, as measured by an overall rating of 4.0 out of 5.0 on the Standards-Walk Through Classroom Instrument.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

A system of grade-level, standards-aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments will be used in all classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By providing standards aligned instruction and assessments, the opportunity for students to master grade-level standards will increase, thereby increasing the probability that students will be prepared for the next grade level, college, and career.

Action Steps to Implement

Train new teachers and refresh returning teachers on the components of standards-based instruction as measured using the Standards Walk-Through Instrument.

Person Responsible

Lamnette Douglas (douglasl@duvalschools.org)

The principal will train the leadership team, faculty and support staff on the purpose and structure of the Professional Learning Community (PLC).

Person Responsible

Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

The leadership team will structure the master schedule to accommodate one hour of uninterrupted time for grade-level/content-focused PLCs to meet once per week.

Person Responsible

Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

The principal, assistant principal, and/or the reading coach will meet with PLCs each week to review student work/data, create assessments, and standards-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible

Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

The principal, assistant principal, and reading coach will measure the alignment of standards in each classroom bi-weekly using the Standards Walk-through Instrument.

Person Responsible

Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

The principal, assistant principal, and reading coach will provide targeted support and coaching to teachers as needed based on data collected during walk-throughs.

Person Responsible Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 23% of African American students are proficient readers as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment, which is significantly less than their white counterparts.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the year, we will increase the number of African American students who are proficient by ten percentage points on the Florida Standards Assessment (3rd-5th) or the I-Ready Reading Diagnostic (K-2nd).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Beginning and struggling readers will receive explicit, systematic phonics instruction in small groups delivered by classroom teachers, the reading interventionist, ESE teachers, Title I tutors and Title I para-professionals. Instruction will be focused on phonics, fluency, and comprehension. Instruction will include the introduction of phonics skills in a systematic manner, judicious review, and progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Systematic phonics instruction has been shown to be effective in initial reading instruction and for struggling readers with an effect size of 0.60.

Action Steps to Implement

The reading coach and her assessment team will administer the placement assessment (Corrective Reading or Reading Mastery) to all new students.

Person Responsible Lamnette Douglas (douglasl@duvalschools.org)

The reading coach will use results of the placement assessment and data from the previous school year for returning students to create groups.

Person Responsible Lamnette Douglas (douglasl@duvalschools.org)

The administrative team will structure the master schedule to allow a dedicated block of time for small group phonics instruction.

Person Responsible Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

Provide refresher training for all faculty and staff members who previously taught one of the intervention programs and schedule formal, initial training for new teachers.

Person Responsible Lamnette Douglas (douglasl@duvalschools.org)

Provide teachers with needed classroom supplies to facilitate phonics instruction.

Person Responsible Lamnette Douglas (douglasl@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Five Essentials survey data from 2019-2020 school year, many students in our school face social emotional challenges. By implementing programs such as Sanford Harmony and Calm Classroom, we will increase a positive school culture and the number of students who feel safe.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the year, 100% of students will have received support from both Sanford Harmony and Calm Classroom. All students will be more equipped to handle social emotional challenges.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony and Calm classroom will be used throughout the day, daily, in all classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing both intervention programs, students will be more equipped to handle social and emotion challenges.

Action Steps to Implement

Train new teachers and refresh returning teachers on the components of both intervention programs.	
Person Responsible	Marva Payne (paynem@duvalschools.org)
Monitor implementation of both programs through classroom visits.	
Person Responsible	Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To improve attendance, we will work to improve the relationship between families and schools, so that we might be more successful in providing support for families of students with poor attendance. Building trust through frequent communication and family engagement activities will help support this relationship. We will also develop a more efficient system of tracking attendance and, when necessary, responding more quickly when student attendance falls below the acceptable range by providing support for families.

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.

To build a positive school culture and environment involving all stakeholders, the leadership team began with the results of the most recent 5 Essentials Survey. We analyzed the data and then created student focus groups and then teacher focus groups. Through the use of specific discussion questions, we gathered additional information from members of the internal stakeholders and formulated areas of focus based on their feedback and suggestions. We met with parents virtually to gather their feedback and combined their suggestions with those of the internal stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00