

Duval County Public Schools

Kernan Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Kernan Middle School

2271 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32276

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

Demographics

Principal: Christine Bicksler Akande

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 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

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

Kernan Middle School

2271 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32276

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>76%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>59%</p>

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.

To build competent and confident students accomplished through standard based instruction, objective and data driven lesson planning, and empowering students through social and emotional development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensure every child is prepared for high school, without having to remediate what they should have learned in middle school. Students will grow in their confidence and their ability to make a positive impact on their own lives, their school, their community and their world.

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
Hemphill, Julie	Principal	
Galeani, John	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Helse, Tyvae	Assistant Principal	Student Services
Henson, Deborah	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Swank, Shelia	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Christine Bicksler Akande

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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/8/2020

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	409	416	371	0	0	0	0	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	46	48	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	46	40	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	198	226	0	0	0	0	646

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	131	145	122	0	0	0	0	398

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	409	416	371	0	0	0	0	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	46	48	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	46	40	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	198	226	0	0	0	0	646

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	131	145	122	0	0	0	0	398

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	57%	43%	54%	51%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	49%	54%	53%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	47%	43%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	60%	49%	58%	50%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	50%	57%	47%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	51%	43%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	44%	51%	58%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	68%	72%	72%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	59%	47%	12%	54%	5%
	2018	56%	44%	12%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	44%	8%	52%	0%
	2018	41%	41%	0%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	51%	49%	2%	56%	-5%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
	2018	50%	42%	8%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	47%	7%	54%	0%
	2018	46%	50%	-4%	54%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	29%	32%	-3%	46%	-17%
	2018	19%	31%	-12%	45%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	52%	40%	12%	48%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	44%	6%	50%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	69%	9%	71%	7%
2018	97%	84%	13%	71%	26%
Compare		-19%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	57%	28%	61%	24%
2018	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	100%	57%	43%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	36	46	40	41	48	47	49	61	54		
ELL	31	51	45	54	54	60	39	84			

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
ASN	67	55	32	80	55		74	86	95		
BLK	42	47	42	42	45	42	38	78	73		
HSP	51	54	37	55	49	53	53	80	87		
MUL	60	55	41	61	59	70	71	90	93		
WHT	66	64	55	68	56	46	62	83	87		
FRL	50	54	49	51	50	48	47	79	84		
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	32	43	36	38	41	29	36	74	73		
ELL	25	48	39	32	43	56	33				
ASN	62	61	41	65	58	50	52	95	94		
BLK	41	50	49	40	44	37	36	87	73		
HSP	47	50	43	45	47	40	32	94	83		
MUL	57	51	36	60	51	25	70	94	76		
WHT	58	53	36	58	51	32	66	95	82		
FRL	46	51	41	43	45	33	41	92	80		
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	23	45	46	27	44	35	33	45	69		
ELL	21	41	43	24	46	48	18	35			
ASN	62	55	31	67	53		72	86	79		
BLK	31	43	40	31	44	40	36	62	57		
HSP	46	56	48	39	42	38	55	54	70		
MUL	64	61	62	63	52	40	71	82	73		
WHT	58	55	43	56	49	49	65	78	70		
FRL	41	48	43	38	42	38	52	64	66		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	597
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	52
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	67
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	50
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	56
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	67
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	65
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.

All questions 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: In order to increase student achievement across all subject areas with all student demographics, we will focus on recommendations based on the research conducted by TNTP and shared in their publication, "The Opportunity Myth."
 1) Every student should have access to grade-appropriate assignments that are standard aligned.
 2) Upon the review of the Standards Based School Continuum document, the new administrative team will need to calibrate observations, as at this point, they would score "weak" on the rubric.
 3) Upon the review of the Standards Based School Continuum rubric, PLCs will focus on developing standard based tasks, using the Learning Arc Planning Tool because subject areas rated themselves between moderate and strong in standards based planning, and between moderate and good in aligned observations.

Measurable Outcome: 1) The new administrative team will move from weak to good in calibrated administration and collaborative administration based on the Standards Based School Continuum Rubric.
 2) Increase our rating from a .3 to a 1 on the student task aligned section of the Standards Walk Through Observation Rubric.
 3) Increase subject area ratings at least one category on the Standards Based School Continuum Rubric in standards based planning and aligned observations, specifically on designing tasks aligned to the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Administration will collaborate with teachers to develop stronger standard based student aligned tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to "The Opportunity Myth" by TNTP, recommendations were made to include rigorous, standard based aligned instruction that is consistent through whole-school collaboration. All students should be exposed to rigorous standard-aligned tasks in every classroom no matter who the teacher or the student is.

Action Steps to Implement

The administrative team will conduct standards based walk-throughs using the district tool as a team to ensure we are calibrated to provide consistent feedback. When the administrative team is calibrated on alignment to standards, we will be better equipped to provide more feedback to teachers and lead PLC work.

Person Responsible Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

Administration will meet weekly to plan upcoming walk-throughs, and review and calibrate walk-through data from the week prior in order to provide effective feedback and develop next steps for PLCs.

Person Responsible Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

Administration will establish an instructional leadership team that consists of PLC leads and department chairs.

Person Responsible Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

The instructional leadership team will meet weekly to study Roger Schwarz work on "The 8 Behaviors of Effective Teams", review standards based walkthrough data, and prioritize the focus for the upcoming PLC work.

Person Responsible Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

PLCs will collaborate to develop and/or implement standard aligned lessons using the Learning Arc Planning Tool, with a specific focus on standard aligned student tasks.

Person Responsible Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

Teachers will bring samples of the standard aligned tasks to review in PLCs to ensure consistent grading practices and standard mastery.

Person Responsible Shelia Swank (swanks1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 19/20 5 Essential Survey data, the are of focus is student-teacher trust. The data supports that this a very weak area overall as it relates to relationships.
 1) Teachers will treat students with respect
 2) Teachers will avoid power struggles with students
 3) Teachers/Admin will create and cultivate a safe, caring, and respectful learning community

Measurable Outcome:
 1) Increase student survey data on the 19/20 5 Essential Survey data from "very weak" to "neutral"
 2) Data shows 8% - the goal is to be at 40%(neutral) by the end of school year on the 19/20 5 Essential Survey data
 3) Increase emphasis on Amazing Osprey wellness class where counselors will survey students frequently to monitor supportive environment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tyvae Helse (helset@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Amazing Ospreys - Daily 30 minute wellness class that currently focuses on student team building, and increasing a positive school climate. For the upcoming school year, the following topics will be included to support the data from the 19/20 5 Essential Survey data:
 - Student-teacher interactions
 - Student-teacher respect,
 - Student-teacher safety
 - Teacher keeping promises

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When analyzing the 19/20 5 Essential Survey data, student-teacher trust 8% (very weak) of students feel that they are not supported by their teachers. It is our goal to maintain a high level of mutual trust and respect between students and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Plan weekly activities for Amazing Ospreys wellness time.

Person Responsible Tyvae Helse (helset@duvalschools.org)

Professional development for teachers pertaining power struggles in the classroom using the download activities from the 5 Essential Survey data.

Person Responsible Tyvae Helse (helset@duvalschools.org)

Weekly survey of students on how they are feeling, as well as how we as a school are improving the caring classroom and teacher-student rapport.

Person Responsible Tyvae Helse (helset@duvalschools.org)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>In review of the 19/20 5 Essential Survey data, we identified the area of focus for the leadership team for the coming year to pinpoint teachers' feelings, worries, and frustrations overall.</p> <p>1) The principal takes a personal interest in professional development for teachers 2) The principal looks out for the personal welfare of faculty members 3) The principal actively listens and takes into consideration teacher recommendations</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Currently, 85% of teachers agree or strongly agree that It's OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with the principal. We would like to see a positive increase in both percentage. In light of COVID-19, it is important that the administrative team works collaboratively to ensure that all stakeholders feel supported and respected based on individual circumstances.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Ms. Hemphill is doing a book study with the admin team with the book "Permission to Feel" by Mark Beckett, and she will share important excerpts with the faculty and staff. In addition to conducting this book study, consistent surveying of teachers feelings will allow admin to check the regular pulse of how teachers are progressing during the current times.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Due to the current events of Covid-19 as well as the 5 Essential Survey data, we realize the importance of remaining aware of the faculty and staffs feelings during these unprecedented times.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

- A book study will be conducted with the admin team "Permission to Feel" by Mark Beckett
- Person Responsible** Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)
- Analyzing excerpts from the book study with faculty and staff to ensure collaboration and enlightenment on their individual feelings.
- Person Responsible** Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)
- Survey faculty and staff quarterly to identify their current thoughts, feelings, and frustrations in order to help find solutions to increase overall morale.
- Person Responsible** Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

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.