

Duval County Public Schools

# Normandy Village Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>26</b> |

# Normandy Village Elementary School

8257 HERLONG RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jessica Sales**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: C (50%)<br>2016-17: D (36%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>26</b> |

## Normandy Village Elementary School

8257 HERLONG RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 81%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | C       | C       | 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 equip teachers, engage students and establish positive relationships with all students.

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

Our vision is to cultivate a culture of academic and social achievement in all students that will prepare them for college and career opportunities.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Sales, Jessica   | Principal           | Provides instructional and organizational leadership, monitors fidelity of instruction to meet school-wide goals to ensure school improvement, monitors student data and adjusts goals to ensure continuous improvement.                     |
| Wright, Angela   | Assistant Principal | Provides instructional and organizational leadership, monitors fidelity of instruction to meet school-wide goals to ensure school improvement, monitors student data and adjusts goals to ensure continuous improvement.                     |
| Marshall, Stacy  | Math Coach          | Monitor student data, facilitates faculty professional development that aligns with academic and climate goals, provides instructional coaching support to teachers and prepares and facilitates professional learning communities meetings. |
| Kozlowski, Megan | Reading Coach       | Monitor student data, facilitates faculty professional development that aligns with academic and climate goals, provides instructional coaching support to teachers and prepares and facilitates professional learning communities meetings. |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/19/2021, Jessica Sales

**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.*

0

**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.*

2

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

35

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

481

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

2

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

2

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

**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                              | 67          | 64 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 401   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 39 | 25 | 34 | 28 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 171   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 2  | 5  | 5  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 5  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 5  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 18 | 33 | 37 | 29 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 173   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 30 | 29 | 38 | 38 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 177   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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           | 28 | 34 | 39 | 34 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 188   |

**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           | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| 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**

Monday 6/7/2021

## 2020-21 - 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               | 74          | 63 | 68 | 63 | 60 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 383   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 30          | 32 | 20 | 25 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 145   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 8  | 5  | 4  | 8  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 1           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 1           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 35          | 54 | 49 | 39 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 218   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 42          | 53 | 52 | 43 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 219   |

**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 | 38          | 53 | 46 | 36 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 203   |

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

## 2020-21 - 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               | 74          | 63 | 68 | 63 | 60 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 383   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 30          | 32 | 20 | 25 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 145   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 8  | 5  | 4  | 8  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 1           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 1           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 35          | 54 | 49 | 39 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 218   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 42          | 53 | 52 | 43 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 219   |

#### 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 | 38          | 53 | 46 | 36 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 203   |

#### 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     | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| 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 Review

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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 33%    | 50%      | 57%   | 35%    | 50%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 53%    | 56%      | 58%   | 50%    | 51%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 50%    | 50%      | 53%   | 52%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 54%    | 62%      | 63%   | 44%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 64%    | 63%      | 62%   | 62%    | 59%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 41%    | 52%      | 51%   | 56%    | 48%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 41%    | 48%      | 53%   | 50%    | 55%      | 55%   |

### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

**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                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 36%    | 51%      | -15%                       | 58%   | -22%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 33%    | 52%      | -19%                       | 58%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -36%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 38%    | 50%      | -12%                       | 56%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -33%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 61%      | -7%                        | 62%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 64%      | -10%                       | 64%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 57%      | -6%                        | 60%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 49%      | -8%                        | 53%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Grades 1 and 2: i-Ready Reading and Math diagnostic assessments

Grades 3-5: district progress monitoring assessments

| Grade 1                  |                               |        |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 12/17% | 20/30% | 27/42% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 9/17%  | 14/28% | 18/36% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 1/10%  | 4/40%  | 3/33%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 12/17% | 20/30% | 33/52% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 10/19% | 15/29% | 23/47% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 1/10%  | 4/40%  | 5/56%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 2                  |                               |        |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 9/14%  | 18/30% | 24/39% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 6/12%  | 15/32% | 21/46% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 0/0%   | 2/17%  | 3/23%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 5/8%   | 10/17% | 24/39% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 5/11%  | 8/17%  | 20/43% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 1/9%   | 1/8%   | 3/23%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 3                  |                               |        |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 14/22% | 13/19% | 24/34% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 11/21% | 10/18% | 21/38% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 0/0%   | 1/10%  | 1/10%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 1/17%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 23/36% | 19/29% | 25/36% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 19/36% | 15/28% | 21/38% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 2/22%  | 1/11%  | 2/20%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 4                  |                               |        |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 18/31% | 21/34% | 23/37% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 12/26% | 15/31% | 17/36% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 1/7%   | 0/0%   | 2/13%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 1/50%  | 1/50%  | 1/50%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 18/32% | 17/27% | 20/32% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 12/27% | 10/21% | 14/30% |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 1/7%   | 0/0%   | 3/20%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 1/50%  | 1/50%  | 1/50%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 5               |                            |        |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 17/32% | 23/39% | 23/38% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 12/29% | 15/33% | 15/32% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4/44%  | 4/40%  | 3/30%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 22/42% | 20/34% | 21/35% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/39% | 13/29% | 14/30% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 3/38%  | 4/44%  | 3/33%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |
| Science               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 14/28% | 14/24% | 20/34% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 10/25% | 10/22% | 12/26% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 2/29%  | 3/30%  | 3/38%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0/0%   | 0/0%   | 0/0%   |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 17       |        |             | 17        | 27      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       | 38     |             | 30        | 31      | 9            | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 22       |        |             | 32        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 40       | 59     |             | 45        | 41      |              | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 27       | 39     |             | 34        | 34      | 8            | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 17       | 52     | 47          | 24        | 61      | 60           | 7        |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 25       | 48     | 47          | 47        | 61      | 46           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 55     |             | 67        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 38       | 60     |             | 53        | 61      | 45           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 29       | 55     | 56          | 50        | 65      | 46           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 11       | 29     |             | 11        | 43      | 31           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 57     | 58          | 44        | 67      | 71           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       |        |             | 36        | 40      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 35       | 38     |             | 40        | 54      | 40           | 75       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 51     | 52          | 44        | 63      | 61           | 51       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 33  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 4   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 234 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| 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%       |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| 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%         |     |

| 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%                      |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 24  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 27  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |     |
| 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%                |     |
| 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%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 43  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 26  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis



## Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

### **What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

ELA: student performance on progress monitoring assessments was consistent with state assessment performance. Student learning gains did improve from progress monitoring assessment to state assessment.

Math: student performance on progress monitoring assessments was consistent with state assessment performance; LPQ students did not show the anticipated gains on state assessment that they did with district progress monitoring assessments

Science: students underperformed on science state assessment in comparison with district progress monitoring assessments.

### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Math proficiency, math learning gains, and lower performing quartile gains for math  
5th grade science proficiency

### **What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

A focused plan of action to improve science and math performance will be developed to improve progress monitoring and student remediation. Consistent use of aligned assessments will be utilized to identify remediation and re-teaching opportunities much earlier and more frequently during the school year.

### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

English lower performing quartile learning gains showed the most improvement.

### **What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Specific writing support and standards-aligned remediation and small group tutoring for lower performing quartile students was implemented in the spring.

### **What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Earlier and more frequent implementation of safety nets will be implemented and more frequent data analysis of student performance on standards.

### **Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will be provided more professional development with standards-focused instruction, data analysis and small group remediation to improve targeted remediation practices.

### **Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Implementation of increased progress monitoring calendars and focused professional development on remediation will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | As a school, we will work to improve our overall perspective of school-wide behavior and positive behavior intervention and supports. Utilizing the 5 Essentials teacher survey data, it was determined that an area of growth for our school culture and climate was in the area of Collective Responsibility. We will work with teacher leaders to develop a stronger culture and climate that allows teachers to collaborate at their grade level and school-wide to improve student behavior and our approach to PBIS.         |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | At least 45% of faculty will agree that nearly all teachers help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom as evidenced by their responses on the 2022 5 Essentials Survey.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Proactive Faculty/Staff Weekly Circles will be used to guide weekly discussions regarding implementation of PBIS and RCA House System.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Proactive Restorative Circles will be held weekly with students and faculty to gather timely feedback and assess needs of all groups. House Meetings will also provide leadership with feedback and suggestions from students and will allow them to take ownership of climate improvements that must be made.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Restorative practices are a proven strategy for improving culture and climate. Implementing proactive circles will be effective because it will increase teacher, staff and student input in the health of our PBIS implementation. The RCA House System has proven effective in improving the school climate on multiple campuses across the country because of its structured approach to school climate and student engagement through leadership development and creating a sense of belonging for every individual on campus. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Leadership will attend RCA House System professional development to learn to structure and implement the NVE House System

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Teacher leaders will plan the development of the NVE House System and refine practices during year 1 implementation

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Progress monitor quarterly discipline data for efficacy of implementation

**Person Responsible** Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

Progress monitor quarterly attendance data for efficacy of implementation

**Person Responsible** Kristi Simpson (simpsonk1@duvalschools.org)

Provide professional development to staff to implement proactive restorative circles during fall release sessions

**Person Responsible** Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

Survey staff for efficacy of proactive circles

**Person Responsible** Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We experienced a 66% decline in referrals last year. Teacher surveys reflect that the school-wide implementation of SEL strategies with fidelity was a critical component in improving student behavior. It is critical to continue implementation of this strategy for continued success.

**Measurable Outcome:** All classrooms will implement SEL strategy Calm Classroom with fidelity. This should allow us to maintain the decline of Class 2 and 3 infractions school-wide.

**Monitoring:** Monthly walk-through observations of implementation and monitoring school-wide referral data will allow us to determine the efficacy of implementation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Stacy Marshall (cribbs@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Calm Classroom provides teachers with strategies to teach self-regulation that will be implemented school-wide at least three times daily.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to the increased amount of time out of school and additional stressors that students may have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is imperative that we take ownership of teaching students how to positively manage their stress. Utilizing these techniques will provide us with a consistent framework to follow school-wide and allow us to monitor the progress of our implementation.

### Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to faculty/staff for year 2 implementation

**Person Responsible** Stacy Marshall (cribbs@duvalschools.org)

Lead monthly walkthrough observations of calm classroom implementation

**Person Responsible** Stacy Marshall (cribbs@duvalschools.org)

Survey staff quarterly to receive feedback of efficacy of implementation

**Person Responsible** Stacy Marshall (cribbs@duvalschools.org)

Quarterly review of discipline data to monitor efficacy of implementation

**Person Responsible** Angela Wright (wrighta2@duvalschools.org)

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

After a review of school-based classroom observation data, it was noted that there has been improvement in the development tasks aligned to standards (from 60% in 2019-20 to 75% in 2020-21) and minimal improvement in observing assessment of student learning during instruction (increased by 1% above last school year to 51%). When students and teachers were asked about the rigor experienced in classrooms in the 5 essentials survey, the overall data shows that students during this year felt they received more rigorous instructions (m score for Academic Press increased from 72 to 95), indicating that students are experiencing the negative impact of the Opportunity Myth. Additionally, based on the teacher response to the 5 Essentials survey regarding collective responsibility, teacher responses indicated that they are not spending enough time collaborating through the use of instructional rounding and reviewing assessment data, even with our increased efforts for assessment monitoring.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increase lessons that incorporate task alignment to standard during observations by 10%.  
Increase lessons that incorporate checks for understanding that determine mastery during instruction observed by 30%.

**Monitoring:**

Weekly collaborative and individual leadership team observations will be conducted to monitor standards-aligned instruction school-wide.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Instructional planning that focuses on task alignment, instructional delivery and developing questions that demonstrate mastery. During planning, we will utilize the process of backwards planning to further focus teacher attention to deeper knowledge of the requirements of the standard, effective methods to assess learning during instruction and designing lessons that incorporate this new learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

There is a plethora of research to support standards based instruction, planning, and relevant professional development:

- Thompson's (2000) Learning Focused
- Daggett's (2008) Rigor Relevance and Relationships
- Hattie's (2009) High Effect Size Strategies
- Knight's (2007) Instructional Coaching

Our rationale for utilizing backwards planning is to ensure teachers are teaching the entire standard and successfully check for understanding during the course of instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate PLCs that focus on standards-aligned lesson planning that incorporates the use of student engagement strategies that accommodate all learning modalities. Utilization of tangible resources (ie manipulatives, technological resources and field experiences) to reinforce learning will be incorporated.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate Data Chats that utilize data from multiple sources (ie. district PMAs, blended learning mastery checks, summative and formative school-based assessments) to realign instructional practice to increase teacher and student efficacy.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Provide professional development opportunities to deepen teacher efficacy and proficiency with facilitation of supplemental and intensive remediation programs (ie Acaletics, Freckle, Reading Intervention programs) to support the instructional needs of their students to increase student performance and proficiency.

**Person Responsible** Megan Kozlowski (kozlowskim@duvalschools.org)

Fund tutor (retired educator) to support students utilizing high-yield strategies for Tier 2 and 3 instruction during the school day.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Fund academic coaches (standards, reading and math) to provide support to teachers when implementing best practices, disaggregate data to make instructional decisions to support improved student academic performance, and provide professional learning opportunities for teachers to improve practice.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Fund additional interactive monitors to enhance whole group instruction and increase use of technology to support instructional delivery in primary classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Use of the Standards Walk-through tool to determine efficacy of the planning process and/or areas to improve practice. Refinement to the planning process will be made based on this review of our data.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Provide monthly TDE days for additional time to develop learning arcs and organize resources that can be used during instruction that are aligned to the standard. Also, utilize this time to create mastery checks to ensure students can show comprehension during instruction. Develop banks of small group remediation for students who do not display mastery.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Fund a paraprofessional to support standards-aligned instruction in 4th and 5th grade math classes.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Fund student planners to communicate PBIS initiatives, student academic performance, homework assignments and other information to parents.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

Fund communication folders to send materials home to parents that communicates academic progress of students and pertinent information relating to school events (ie parent nights, academic testing, etc) and student achievement.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on 2020-21 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 66%, 4th grade is 72%, and 5th grade is 71%.

o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%

**Measurable Outcome:**

K-5 data:

\*Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

\*Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Sales (salesj@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.



Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-into-big-wins>

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progress-monitoring-improves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. <https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teaching-strategies/>

### Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales ([salesj@duvalschools.org](mailto:salesj@duvalschools.org))

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales ([salesj@duvalschools.org](mailto:salesj@duvalschools.org))

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership, district content specialists, and district leadership.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Sales ([salesj@duvalschools.org](mailto:salesj@duvalschools.org))

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities



Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**Our School Leadership team will address all remaining schoolwide improvement priorities by:**

- 1. Prioritizing staffing needs to ensure we are fully staffed on day 1**
- 2. Support Novice Teachers through monthly meetings and regular temperature checks to meet their needs**
- 3. Implementing and monitoring implementation of curriculum, intervention and supplementary programs with fidelity using weekly classroom visits, providing timely feedback, and addressing facilitation concerns during weekly PLCs.**
- 4. Conducting weekly data analysis and planning for intervention to support student achievement**
- 5. Improve parent engagement by offering virtual opportunities to engage with teachers in lieu of face-to-face meetings**

### **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.**

Communication is essential to building positive relationships with all stakeholders. At Normandy Village, we communicate frequently with stakeholders. There are newsletters sent home in Tuesday folder. Emails, phone calls, post on social media accounts, and updates to the school's website occur every Sunday. Teachers conduct parent conference to keep parents informed about the academic progress of their children. The school collaborates with stakeholders through monthly SAC meetings and provide opportunities for input on school

matters. The school has an open door policy where parents are invited to participate in various events such as family nights, open house, and back to school orientation.

Additionally, school officials have developed partnerships with multiple organizations and faith based partners to enhance student experiences and engage stakeholders during the 2020-2021 school year.

Organizations represented include:

Rise Church

Communities in School

Parent Academy (DCPS)

Delores Barr Weaver Policy Center

Westside Baptist Church

Jacksonville Public Education Fund

### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Rise Church is one of our faith-based partner that supports school-wide initiatives to boost student and faculty/staff morale that includes welcome back gifts to faculty/staff, campus beautification, holiday food and gift drives for families in need, back pack drives, donation of groceries and grocery gift cards during pandemic, and teacher appreciation meals.

Communities in School is our after-school programs partner that provides a safe place for our scholars to engage in academic supports and fun activities in an extended day environment on campus through TEAM UP. CIS communicates with community partners to provide enriching experiences on and off site during the school year and summer. TEAM UP is free of charge for all participants.

Parent Academy (DCPS) provides support to our parents utilizing a variety of topics to help them to better support their scholars at home and prepare them for transition into college or other post-secondary avenues.

Delores Barr Weaver Policy Center provides our female students with drop out prevention and SEL supports via Girl Matters. Scholars are connected with a staff member that engages them to remain connected in school, both academically and socially.

Westside Baptist Church is another faith-based partner that supports school-wide initiatives to boost student and faculty/staff morale that includes welcome back gifts to faculty/staff and a clothing closet for our scholars who may need uniforms or a change of clothes during the school day.

## Part V: Budget

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

|          |               |   |   |                 |     |                     |
|----------|---------------|---|---|-----------------|-----|---------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports</b> |   |                 |     | <b>\$2,117.90</b>   |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE | 2021-22             |
|          | 5100          | 510-Supplies  | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$1,442.90          |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: TO SUPPORT PARENT COMMUNICATION ABOUT STUDENT LEARNING AND BEHAVIOR</i> |                 |     |                     |
|          | 5100          | 510-Supplies  | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$675.00            |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: TO SUPPORT PARENT COMMUNICATION ABOUT STUDENT LEARNING AND BEHAVIOR</i> |                 |     |                     |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>                   |   |                 |     | <b>\$0.00</b>       |
| <b>3</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>                  |   |                 |     | <b>\$205,527.10</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE | 2021-22             |
|          | 6400          | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel   | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$71,094.00         |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: INSTRUCTIONAL READING COACH</i>   |                 |     |                     |
|          | 6400          | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel   | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$71,100.00         |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: INSTRUCTIONAL MATH COACH</i>  |                 |     |                     |
|          | 5900          |   | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$9,796.00          |

|  |      |   |   |                 |  |             |
|--|------|---|---|-----------------|--|-------------|
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: P/T TUTOR</i>   |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 150-Aides   | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$28,201.49 |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: ELEMENTARY PARA, F/T</i>  |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 648-Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment    | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$6,885.00  |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: NEC 65" UHD COLLABORATIVE DISPLAY-WHITLOCK OR EMTEC TO IMPROVE DIRECT STUDENT INSTRUCTION AND COLLECT DATA DURING INSTRUCTION</i>                                       |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 648-Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment    | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$2,397.00  |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: LENOVO PROCESSORS (INSTALLED WITH INTERACTIVE CARTS)-MOORECO DUVAL CAR BUNDLE TO IMPROVE DIRECT STUDENT INSTRUCTION AND COLLECT DATA DURING INSTRUCTION</i>             |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 648-Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment    | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$3,315.00  |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: ALL IN LEARNING 34 AIRLEAF PAD AND CLOUD (3YRS) TO IMPROVE DIRECT STUDENT INSTRUCTION AND COLLECT DATA DURING INSTRUCTION</i>   |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   |                 |  | \$1,035.00  |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: HOVERCAM SOLO 8 PLUS DOCUMENT CAMERA TO IMPROVE DIRECT STUDENT INSTRUCTION AND COLLECT DATA DURING INSTRUCTION</i>  |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$515.97    |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: VDO360 2SEE USB HD VIDEO CONFERENCE CAMERA/ LOGITECH K400 PLUS TOUCHPAD WIRELESS TO IMPROVE DIRECT STUDENT INSTRUCTION AND COLLECT DATA DURING INSTRUCTION KEYBOARD</i> |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$405.00    |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: ANCHOR AUDIO AC POWERED SPEAKER AND MOUNT</i>   |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$1,560.00  |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: INSTALLATION-6 HOURS PER CART/CUSTOM 4K CABLE SET</i>   |                 |  |             |
|  | 6400 | 510-Supplies  | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   |                 |  | \$1,000.00  |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: BOOK STUDY FOR STAFF-BARNES AND NOBLE TO IMPROVE CULTURALLY RELEVANT INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES TO REACH ALL LEARNERS</i>  |                 |  |             |
|  | 5100 | 644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized                                   | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$1,892.70  |
|  |      |   | <i>Notes: LENOVO TINY PC FOR INTERACTIVE CART TO IMPROVE DIRECT STUDENT INSTRUCTION AND COLLECT DATA DURING INSTRUCTION</i>   |                 |  |             |
|  | 6400 | 510-Supplies  | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |  | \$500.00    |

|   |        |   |  |                 |        |              |
|---|--------|---|--|-----------------|--------|--------------|
|   |        |   | Notes: STOREROOM/OFFICE DEPOT-STICK EASEL NOTEPADS   |                 |        |              |
|   | 5100   | 510-Supplies                                | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |        | \$3,910.00   |
|   |        |   | Notes: CLASSROOM SUPPLIES TO SUPPORT INSTRUCTION   |                 |        |              |
|   | 5100   | 510-Supplies                                | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |        | \$919.94     |
|   |        |   | Notes: STOREROOM/VENDOR-TBD- EARBUDS, TONER, LAMINIATING FILM TO SUPPORT INSTRUCTION                       |                 |        |              |
|   | 6400   | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 2211 - Normandy Village Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |        | \$1,000.00   |
|   |        |   | Notes: *Masters \$1,000/Specialist \$1,200/Doctorate Degree \$1,500/Level 95 Supplement \$1,000 MATH COACH |                 |        |              |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA |  |                 |        | \$0.00       |
|   |        |   |  |                 | Total: | \$207,645.00 |