Baldwin Middle Senior High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Baldwin Middle Senior High School

291 MILL ST W, Baldwin, FL 32234

www.duvalschools.org/bmsh

Demographics

Principal: Michael Townsend

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	71%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

<div style="background:#2e3a74; color:white; text-align:center; font-weight:bold;">

Baldwin Middle Senior High School

</div>

291 MILL ST W, Baldwin, FL 32234

www.duvalschools.org/bmsh

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)
High School 6-12	Yes	67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Baldwin Middle-Senior High School is dedicated to providing high-quality educational opportunities for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A place where every member of the Baldwin Middle-Senior High School family is inspired and equipped for success in post-secondary education, a career, and 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
Hall, Denise	Principal	
Adams, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Kirk, Angela Kinlin	Teacher, K-12	
Graham, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Shields, Steve	Dean	
Roberts, Valencia	Teacher, ESE	
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/30/2020, Michael Townsend

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.*
3

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
66

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	71%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	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	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	177	175	220	175	199	158	113	1217
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	44	35	33	22	36	214
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	23	14	21	11	16	44	141
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	33	9	32	29	14	4	140
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	58	69	50	47	17	4	280

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	86	115	102	112	79	48	75	617

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	10	6	2	4	8	0	2	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	175	220	175	199	158	113	1217
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	44	35	33	22	36	214
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	23	14	21	11	16	44	141
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	33	9	32	29	14	4	140
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	58	69	50	47	17	4	280

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	86	115	102	112	79	48	75	617

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	10	6	2	4	8	0	2	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	47%	56%	36%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	48%	51%	43%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	42%	42%	36%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	51%	51%	51%	46%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	52%	48%	46%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	45%	33%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	45%	65%	68%	47%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	70%	73%	53%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(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**
06	2019	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
	2018	41%	44%	-3%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
	2018	31%	41%	-10%	51%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	36%	49%	-13%	56%	-20%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	58%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
09	2019	36%	48%	-12%	55%	-19%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	43%	48%	-5%	53%	-10%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
	2018	41%	42%	-1%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	47%	5%	54%	-2%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	54%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	33%	32%	1%	46%	-13%
	2018	23%	31%	-8%	45%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	34%	40%	-6%	48%	-14%
	2018	35%	44%	-9%	50%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	54%	67%	-13%	67%	-13%
2018	55%	63%	-8%	65%	-10%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	72%	69%	3%	71%	1%
2018	83%	84%	-1%	71%	12%
Compare		-11%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	60%	68%	-8%	70%	-10%
2018	48%	64%	-16%	68%	-20%
Compare		12%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	61%	57%	4%	61%	0%
2018	72%	61%	11%	62%	10%
Compare		-11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	45%	61%	-16%	57%	-12%
2018	56%	57%	-1%	56%	0%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-11%			

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	18	37	36	31	38	35	22	50	60	73	82
ELL	31	67		31	33						
ASN	58	50		83	55						
BLK	31	44	45	40	46	48	35	54	50	94	90
HSP	44	50	38	55	56	60	44	59			
MUL	46	36		52	41		73	73			
WHT	43	48	42	54	51	42	47	71	62	89	94
FRL	32	42	38	42	47	42	37	57	61	87	93

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	17	40	40	31	42	33	16	45		100	74
ASN	64	64									
BLK	31	48	43	40	44	38	32	48	57	100	87
HSP	42	47		38	57	50	33				
MUL	42	59		50	61						
WHT	45	47	44	53	45	43	48	72	71	91	89
FRL	35	46	44	40	41	39	36	64	45	90	82

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	13	32	31	19	32	26	18	24		62	
BLK	27	44	40	35	45	33	27	40	64	100	81
HSP	40	56		48	52		44	56			
MUL	43	41		65	58		60	60			
WHT	39	42	33	50	45	32	55	58	71	87	90
FRL	26	38	35	38	43	36	38	45	69	91	79

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	628
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	62
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	52
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	51
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	54
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	58
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	53
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.

All question need to be completed

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

-

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.

-

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

-

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

-

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

1. -
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus for Baldwin M-S High is the standards aligned instructional delivery process. As indicated by the 5essentials survey, less than 60% of our teachers support the notion of collective responsibility whose foundation is set through collaboration in PLC and common planning, and this clearly indicates that our students' growth are negatively impacted.
Measurable Outcome:	The vast majority of our teachers will engage in meaningful standards-based instructional delivery that will boost instructional practices as observed via walkthrough protocols and instructional lead teacher observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments and promotes targeted student growth at each level. Utilizing the District's Standards Walkthrough tool and the Baldwin's ILT Observation tool, aligned standards and experiences within the instructional delivery can be measured. Common planning and professional learning communities will be monitored and used as the vehicle to ensure that the standards-based instruction and standards aligned tasks and assessments are the responsibility of all teachers in each instructional team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Marzano's research shows that instructional delivery aligned to the collaborative practices centered around standards ensures that tasks and assessments are congruent to set standards, making certain that students show growth beyond previous proficiency levels.

Action Steps to Implement	
Workshop the administrative team on the Standards Based Instruction Continuum and SIP	
Person Responsible	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)
Workshop the OPS and ILT Teams on the Standards Based Instruction and SIP	
Person Responsible	Michael Adams (adamsm2@duvalschools.org)
Workshop the teachers on the Standards Based Instruction and SIP	
Person Responsible	Joseph Graham (grahamj@duvalschools.org)
Workshop SAC on the Standards Based Instruction and SIP	
Person Responsible	Michael Adams (adamsm2@duvalschools.org)
Revisit the 2018-2019 FSA data with teachers while noting the indicated trend data as it relates to proficiency levels	
Person Responsible	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)
Conduct Professional Development to ensure there is a deeper understanding as it relates to Common Planning and Professional Learning Communities	

Person Responsible	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)

Conduct initial workshop and construct protocols for Common Planning and PLC

Person Responsible	Valencia Roberts (robertsv@duvalschools.org)

Conduct ILT coaching observations to assess needs and create coaching opportunities.

Person Responsible	Angela Kinlin Kirk (kirka@duvalschools.org)

Conduct Walkthroughs with the administrative team to calibrate the work.

Person Responsible	Michael Adams (adamsm2@duvalschools.org)

Conduct ongoing professional development concerning collaboration and standards-based instruction based on needs observed.

Person Responsible	Nancy Ballard (ballardn@duvalschools.org)

Conduct Checkpoints to ensure that we are implementing SIP strategies and modify/extend as needed

Person Responsible	Joseph Graham (grahamj@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The focus is to improve the engagement of all students and raise the teacher expectations in planning and preparing for life after graduation as reflected in classroom instructional support, feedback, and communication of post-secondary opportunities. As indicated by the 5essentials survey, students feel as if the focus, feedback, and support as it relates to post-secondary preparedness has not been as helpful to their daily instruction and interaction. What negatively impacts students' feeling of support negatively impacts student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	All of our teachers participate in district walkthrough and instructional lead teacher observations which include teacher & student discourse and student engagement. This data will be used for monitoring. The EOY 5Essentials survey will be used as the final measure.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective feedback, a clear vision for the future and instructional support are building blocks of a solid instructional foundation for students and their future. Utilizing the District's Standards Walkthrough and the Baldwin's ILT Observations coupled with these supports along with opportunity for student voice will enable teachers to focus and grow in the area of supporting the whole child.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie's work on effective feedback and focus is rooted in provided students with a sense of support using specific feedback and hope coupled with clear direction on how to grow instructionally.

Action Steps to Implement

Workshop the administrative team on the effective feedback and instructional support.

Person Responsible	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)

Workshop the OPS and ILT Teams on the standards-focus observations, coaching and effective feedback methods.

Person Responsible	Michael Adams (adamsm2@duvalschools.org)

Conduct initial workshop and construct protocols for classroom observations, instructional expectations and establish/reinforce the school vision.

Person Responsible	Valencia Roberts (robertsv@duvalschools.org)

Workshop the teachers on the standards-based instruction and the observation tools to be used.

Person Responsible	Nancy Ballard (ballardn@duvalschools.org)

Conduct ILT coaching observations to assess needs and create coaching opportunities.

Person Responsible	Angela Kinlin Kirk (kirka@duvalschools.org)

Conduct walkthroughs with the administrative team to calibrate the work.

Person Responsible	Michael Adams (adamsm2@duvalschools.org)

Implement AVID program in middle school learning community to set a foundation for post-secondary goals.

Person Responsible	Angela Kinlin Kirk (kirka@duvalschools.org)

Create opportunity for students to make connections between current instructional work with future, post-secondary plans.

Person Responsible	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)

Create student voice opportunities to gather data on student perception of their instructional environment.

Person Responsible	Angela Kinlin Kirk (kirka@duvalschools.org)

Conduct ongoing professional development activities as needed based on observational data and teacher requests in response to observational feedback.

Person Responsible	Joseph Graham (grahamj@duvalschools.org)

Conduct Checkpoints to ensure that we are providing useful feedback, threading the common vision throughout organizational activities, and providing instructional support as needed.

Person Responsible	Denise Hall (halld@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

na

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.

Needs to be completed

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: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**