Cedar Hills Elementary School

leadership
analysis
college and career
Florida
students
mission
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cedar Hills Elementary School

6534 ISH BRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/cedarhills

Demographics

Principal: Marva Mckinney M

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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

Cedar Hills Elementary School

6534 ISH BRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/cedarhills

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 KG-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	79%

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.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every school for every student everyday.Cedar Hills Elementary is committed to providing highly quality educational opportunities that will inspire all students to acquire and use the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in a global economy and culturally diverse world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or 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
McKinney, Marva	Principal	Principal (Marva McKinney)Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing interventions and support relating to all programs. The principal ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, RMSE, Corrective Reading and Acaletics. Mrs. McKinney collaborates with the Leadership Team for plannning and achieving academic goals for improving the school as a whole. Mrs. McKinney collaborates with the team daily, formal meetings take place once weekly. The Qualtrics Survey is one tool that is used to gather information from the faculty and staff, this information assists with the shared decision making process to determine the scope and sequence of professional development for the school year.
Bylerley-Ray, Megan	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Megan Ray is responsible for articulating a clear instructional vision alongside the principal with a school-wide focus on teaching and learning that is data-driven and rooted in the belief that all students can achieve at high levels. Megan Ray, with the principal, and the Leadership Team is responsible for implementing consistent school-wide instructional practices that are clear, results-oriented and research-based. Megan Ray is instrumental in creating opportunities for ongoing learning and staff development that are informed by data. Megan Ray and the Leadership Team meet twice a week and complete weekly calibration walks utilizing the Standard Walkthrough Tool.
Taylor, Vincent	Instructional Coach	Mr. Taylor has numerous duties he performs in a given week. Mondays are dedicated to debriefing with administration during Leadership meetings regarding the progress or concerns of the school. Bi-weekly he collaborates with the Reading Coach to plan Professional Learning Communities workshops for all teachers. Thursdays are designated for Common Planning where he facilitates meetings that has teachers collaborating with each other to discover best teaching and learning practices. Mr. Taylor, after modeling a lesson, will intermittently meet with teachers to provide feedback to their lessons taught. Finally, he is self-reflective always striving to grow professionally and pushes his colleagues to do the same.
Logan, Teresa	Other	The Leadership Team provides direction, instructions and guidance to all teachers towards achieving academic goals and improving the school as a whole. The Leadership Team collaborates daily, formal meetings take place once weekly. The Qualtrics Survey is one tool that is used to gather information from the faculty and staff, this information assists with the shared decision making process to determine the scope and sequence of professional development for the school year.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Woods, Courtney	Instructional Coach	As a Reading Coach, I will support all K-5 staff with implementation of the reading curriculum and reading resources. I work directly with teachers in this school providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative practices, and one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher inquiry that relates to professional development. The goal as a Reading Coach is to focus on enhancing teachers' abilities to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement, ownership of learning, and mastery with standards. In addition, I will also work with my administrators and teachers to collect and analyze data, interpret, and use it to guide instructional practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/16/2020, Marva Mckinney M

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
26

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students

	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	67	78	85	101	83	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	4	31	31	44	53	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	1	6	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/16/2020

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	78	80	89	107	84	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	1	9	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	2	5	1	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	5	17	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	4	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	78	80	89	107	84	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	1	9	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	2	5	1	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	5	17	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	4	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	26%	50%	57%	33%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	56%	58%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	57%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	42%	62%	63%	41%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	63%	62%	44%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	48%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	48%	53%	37%	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	28%	51%	-23%	58%	-30%
	2018	22%	50%	-28%	57%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	27%	52%	-25%	58%	-31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	25%	49%	-24%	56%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	28%	50%	-22%	56%	-28%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	61%	-23%	62%	-24%
	2018	24%	59%	-35%	62%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	64%	-20%	64%	-20%
	2018	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	42%	57%	-15%	60%	-18%
	2018	43%	61%	-18%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	49%	-17%	53%	-21%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
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	26	35	21	25	20	8				
ELL	21	18		21	27						
BLK	18	44	50	36	54	52	22				
HSP	19	29		35	38						
WHT	41	43		58	51		60				
FRL	25	44	49	39	48	44	30				

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	27	29	18	50						
ELL	8	60		33	60						
BLK	23	33	20	33	55	43	38				
HSP	26	31		37	50						
WHT	30	32		53	65		63				
FRL	23	35	30	39	62	56	47				

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	9	26	43	17	40	45	9				
ELL	7	30		29	30						
BLK	27	47	56	36	42	52	30				
HSP	37	64		53	64						
WHT	48	51		48	49		50				
FRL	31	52	56	41	45	43	27				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	315
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	24
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	51
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	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.

The lowest area of performance was in ELA achievement at 26%. Some of the contributing factors include novice teachers, teacher turnover, and a new reading curriculum. Teachers were trained throughout the school year for RMSE and Corrective reading

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

The lowest area of performance was in bottom quartile math and math learning gains. Some of the contributing factors include novice teachers, teacher turnover, and a new math curriculum

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 largest gap in performance is ELA achievement. Some of the contributing factors include novice teachers, teacher turnover, and a new reading curriculum. Teachers were trained throughout the school year for RMSE and Corrective reading

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

ELA lowest 25 percent showed the most improvement, this may be contributed to RMSE and Corrective reading

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

Attendance below 90 percent
Level 1 on statewide assessments

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Science Achievement
3. Learning Gains ELA/Math
4. Lowest 25th percentile ELA
5. Lowest 25th percentile Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers are learning to consistently deliver instruction that is aligned to grade level standards . Teachers are learning how to create student tasks that align to the grade level standards along with the learning arcs, they are also differentiate instruction based on the needs of the student. FSA 2018 - 2019,Cedar Hills students increased in reading profiency 26% (+1) ,learning gains to 41% (+7) and BQ 49% (+21)
Measurable Outcome:	100% of Cedar Hills Elementary ELA teachers will demonstrate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations in the areas of Planning and Delivering Standards.The intended outcome is for all students to receive standards-basedinstruction daily during whole group as well as a small group to increase both reading and writing proficiency. Supplemental programs have been implemented , Reading Mastery Special Edition (RMSE) is used for students in (K-2) and Corrective Reading for our students in grades (3-5) these programs are designed to assist with reading deficiencie. The use of these programs helped to increase reading proficiency as previously shown on the FSA 2018 - 2019,Cedar Hills students increased in reading profiency 26% (+1) ,learning gains to 41% (+7) and BQ 49% (+21)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marva McKinney (mckinneym3@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on Standards Walkthrough Tool, our school team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes. Common Planning and PLC's will also be utilized as an evidenced based strategy along with coaching cycles as needed, Coaching cycles will be implemented by the Reading and Math Coach to provide support with lesson planning and implementation. Additionally, programs such as Reading Mastery Signature Edition and Corrective Reading are being used to help students master essential decoding and comprehension skills. These strategies will promote teaching reading to reading instructors while ensuring that content and assessments are aligned to standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Coaching cycles will enhance the opportunity for teachers to observe one another's teaching strategies then debrief with the administration and reading coach to improve their knowledge of grade level standards and best instructional practices. Teachers will also be observed while teaching the direct instruction programs which support how schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.as expressed in the Opportunity Myth.

Action Steps to Implement

Attend weekly common planning to focus on standards alignment and Learning Arc.All teachers will use learning arcs and the "KUD's protocol" they will identify the skills and strategies for the standard prior to common planning. The Reading Coach will plan for the progression of standards one month before Common Planning. During common planning, teachers will collaborate to identify more differentiated resources to scaffold and ensure the student work and instruction align to the standard. PLC's will take place every second and last Tuesday of each month to support this work.

Person Responsible	Marva McKinney (mckinneym3@duvalschools.org)

Attend weekly common planning to focus on standards alignment and Learning Arcs. Review and train on Learning Arcs. Support from the Reading Coach/Interventionist to plan instruction and break down standards.Support for teachers with planning and implementing new strategies (Learning Arc/PLC vs.Common Planning). Frequent data chats with teachers and students and weekly walk-throughs to calibrate school-wide expectations

Person Responsible Megan Bylerley-Ray (byerleym@duvalschools.org)

Attend weekly common planning to focus on standards alignment and Learning Arc. Review and train on Learning Arcs. Support for teachers with planning and implementing new strategies (Learning Arc/PLC vs.Common Planning). Continue weekly walkthroughs with Admin.Conduct weekly data chats with teachers and weekly walk-throughs to calibrate school-wide expectations Reading Coach will provide professional development for Kindergarten through 5th grade teachers and Paraprofessionals. The Reading Coach will provide professional development in grades 3-5 on the following: Progression of the FSA Standards, How to Teach FSA ELA Standards: How to Teach FSA Writing, Understanding and Grading FSA Writing with the State Rubric, and Differentiating Instruction in Whole and Small Group Settings. In addition, the coach will provide professional development to K-2nd grade teachers on the following: Learning Arcs, Phonemic Awareness/Phonics Instructional Routines, Primary Writing Techniques, and Utilizing Primary Centers.

Person Responsible Courtney Woods (ellisc@duvalschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our focus will be on standards-based grade-level instruction and differentiated this instruction based on the individual needs of students;student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction planning procedures.The intended outcome is for all students to receive standards-based instruction daily in whole group as well as in a small group to increase math proficiency. We will continue to use supplemental material Acaletics which that has been implemented in grades 2nd - 5th We will also continue using I-Ready and Eureka
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vincent Taylor (taylorv2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on Standards Walkthrough Tool, our school team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes. Professional Development that takes place during PLC's and common planning will assist teachers with identifying deficiencies and planning instruction to meet the needs of all learners better.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cedar Hills Elementary will host Parent Family Nights to assist parents with helping their children in the area of math. The necessary supplies will be provided for parents to complete these activities. Parents will have an opportunuty to use the parent resource room to check out any math materials they need to assist their child at home.

Action Steps to Implement

Assistant Principal will attend weekly common planning with the focus of standards based Instruction and the Learning Arcs.The Assistant Principal and Math Coach will provide assistance with planning instruction and breaking down standards, support teachers with planning and implementing new strategies. Students will participate in small group instruction by the math coach and weekly data chats with occur teachers and

Person Responsible	Megan Bylerley-Ray (byerleym@duvalschools.org)

The Math Coach will attend weekly common planning and PLC's with a focus on Standards Based Instruction and the Learning Arcs.The Assistant Principal and Math Coach will provide assistance with planning instruction and breaking down standards, support teachers with planning and implementing new strategies, students will participate in small group instruction by the math coach and weekly data chats with occur teachers and studentsAdmin weekly walkthroughs for alignment. Continued use of Eureka Math, Acaletics K-5, and Performance Coach. Targeted selection of students participating in the 21st Century after school program.
Utilizing:
Implementation of Eureka Math
Implementation of Acaletics
Implement Eureka Succeed Workbook
Implement Performance Coach in the after school program

Person Responsible	Vincent Taylor (taylorv2@duvalschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers are learning to consistently deliver instruction that is aligned to grade level standards . Teachers are learning how to create student tasks that align to the grade level standards along with the Learning Arcs, they are also differentiate instruction based on the needs of the student. FSA 2018 - 2019,Cedar Hills students increased in reading profiency 26% (+1) ,learning gains to 41% (+7) and BQ 49% (+21)
Measurable Outcome:	100% of Cedar Hills Elementary ELA teachers will demonstrate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations in the areas of Planning and Delivering Standards.The intended outcome is for all students to receive standards-based instruction daily during whole group as well as a small group to increase both reading and writing proficiency. Supplemental programs have been implemented , Reading Mastery Special Edition (RMSE) is used for students in (K-2) and Corrective Reading for our students in grades (3-5) these programs are designed to assist with reading deficiencies. The use of these programs helped to increase reading proficiency as previously shown on the FSA 2018 - 2019,Cedar Hills students increased in reading profiency 26% (+1) ,learning gains to 41% (+7) and BQ 49% (+21)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marva McKinney (mckinneym3@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on Standards Walkthrough Tool, our school team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes. Common Planning and PLC's will also be utilized as an evidenced based strategy along with coaching cycles as needed, Coaching cycles will be implemented by the Reading and Math Coach to provide support with lesson planning and implementation beyond Common Planning. Additionally, programs such as Reading Mastery Signature Edition and Corrective Reading are being used to help students master essential decoding and comprehension skills. These strategies will promote teaching reading to reading instructors while ensuring that content and assessments are aligned to standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Coaching cycles will enhance the opportunity for teachers to observe one another's teaching strategies then debrief with the administration and reading coach to improve their knowledge of grade level standards and best instructional practices. Teachers will also be observed while teaching the direct instruction programs which support how schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.as expressed in the Opportunity Myth.

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will use Learning Arcs and the "KUD's protocol" they will identify the skills and strategies for the standard prior to common planning. The Reading Coach will plan for the progression of standards one month before Common Planning. During common planning, teachers will collaborate to identify more differentiated resources to scaffold and ensure the student work and instruction align to the standard. PLC's will take place every second and last Tuesday of each month to support this work. I will continue using Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery Signature Edition, I-Ready LAFS materials and Performance Coach.
There will be a targeted selection of students participating in the 21st century after school program. Cedar Hills will be utilizing the following materials:
Implement Corrective Reading Program

Implementation of Reading Mastery Signature Edition
LAFS Materials as Core Reading
Implement Performance Coach in the after school program

Person Responsible Marva McKinney (mckinneym3@duvalschools.org)

The Reading Coach and tutors that are trained in Reading Mastery Signature Edition and Corrective Reading will work with small groups of students for remediation. The Reading Coach will attend weekly common planning to focus on standards alignment and Learning Arc. Review and train on Learning Arcs. Support for teachers with planning and implementing new strategies (Learning Arc/PLC vs.Common Planning). Continue weekly walkthroughs with Admin.Conduct weekly data chats with teachers and weekly walk-throughs to calibrate school-wide expectations. Reading Coach will provide professional development for Kindergarten through 5th grade teachers and Paraprofessionals. The Reading Coach will provide professional development in grades 3-5 on the following: Progression of the FSA Standards, How to Teach FSA ELA Standards: How to Teach FSA Writing, Understanding and Grading FSA Writing with the State Rubric, and Differentiating Instruction in Whole and Small Group Settings. In addition, the coach will provide professional development to K-2nd grade teachers on the following: Learning Arcs, Phonemic Awareness/Phonics Instructional Routines, Primary Writing Techniques, and Utilizing Primary Centers.

Person Responsible Courtney Woods (ellisc@duvalschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Professional Development-Teachers will take palce weelky during common planning,and PLC's wil take place every second and fourth Tuesdauy of each month. The GEERS program will take palce for 12 Saturdays in an effort to address student needs and deficiencies.

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.

As the 2019 Brian J. Davis Fellow for School Climate & Culture, I am working to develop a shared mission and vision, positive relationships, and community engagement with all of our staff, students and stakeholders
I want to expand these opportunities of utilizing teachers as mentors and including community members such as firemen, policemen and the military, to be able to provide positive experiences. The outcome is to promote a school culture that contributes to socialand emotional learning with a focus on diversity and inclusion, empathy and critical thinking, communication, problem solving and peer relationships. This alignment will
contribute to an increase in student achievement and a healthy classroom and school
environment. The school will reach out to business and the community to build partnerships and discussion. Cedar Hills will do this in a variety of ways which include :SAC and PTA, Business Partnership Liaison,Utilizing, Full Service Schools,Communication with parents through DoJo, Class Tag, Tuesday Folders, and monthly newsletters, Utilizing Calm Classroom Curriculum and Parent Academy.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**