

Duval County Public Schools

R. V. Daniels Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

R. V. Daniels Elementary School

1951 W 15TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

Demographics

Principal: Johnny Bryant

Start Date for this Principal: 12/7/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

R. V. Daniels Elementary School

1951 W 15TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>90%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>97%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To implement gifted strategies to provide creative, analytical, and verbal learning experiences for students to explore their unique talents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every R.V.Daniels student will be inspired to unlock their unique potential in pursuit of life-long learning.

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
Bryant, Johnny	Principal	
Kirkland, Katherine	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 12/7/2020, Johnny Bryant

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

321

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

3

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

3

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	23	47	62	63	53	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	1	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/28/2021

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	52	53	56	66	66	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	360
Attendance below 90 percent	8	3	3	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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	52	53	56	66	66	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	360
Attendance below 90 percent	8	3	3	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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				62%	50%	57%	72%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	58%	70%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	50%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	62%	63%	84%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	63%	62%	76%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	52%	51%	62%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	48%	53%	79%	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	50%	51%	-1%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	50%	24%	56%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	64%	-7%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	57%	33%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	73%	49%	24%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress Monitoring tools used by grades K-2 were i-Ready Reading and Math, Reading Mastery diagnostics. Progress monitoring tools used by grades 3-5 were i-Ready Reading and Math, Freckle, Achieve3000, Progress Monitoring Assessments.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		20/38%	26/55%	33/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged		8/27%	10/38%	12/43%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		11/21%	18/45%	21/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged		5/17%	7/33%	8/42%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	0/0%	1/33%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
		Grade 2			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		18/33%	22/42%	28/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged		6/20%	8/28%	12/40%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	0/0%	1/20%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	1/100%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		9/17%	22/44%	23/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged		2/7%	8/30%	7/23%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/33%	20/41%	23/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/20%	9/29%	11/37%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/14%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	1/50%	1/50%	1/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25/52%	19/39%	20/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/40%	8/26%	8/27%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	0/0%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	2/100%	2/100%	2/100%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29/47%	36/57%	30/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/32%	10/31%	8/28%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	1/20%	1/20%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35/56%	35/56%	28/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/42%	11/34%	6/21%
	Students With Disabilities	2/50%	2/40%	1/20%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		24/38%	29/47%	35/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged		6/21%	7/26%	13/50%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	1/100%
			Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students		30/49%	29/47%	26/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged		7/27%	5/19%	5/19%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners		1/100%	1/100%	1/100%
			Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Science	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				

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	8			17							
ASN	93	71		100	64		80				
BLK	41	21		45	24	7	24				
FRL	35	14		38	18	9	19				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	92	70		100	97		83				
BLK	50	50	32	63	43	25	63				
MUL	100	70		100	80						
FRL	44	47	32	60	37	23	48				

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
ASN	100	96		100	92		100				
BLK	64	60	35	78	69	59	70				
MUL	91			100							
FRL	59	56	35	75	70	61	65				

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	225
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	82

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	19
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?

When analyzing 3rd through 5th grade 2020-21 reading and math progress monitoring assessment data from fall to spring, the trends that emerged was a follows:
3rd Grade- reading there was a 12 percentage point average increase from fall to spring and for math the percentage point average that held steady from fall to spring.
4th Grade- reading there was a 5 percentage point average decrease from fall to spring and for math there was a 2 percentage point increase from fall to spring.
5th Grade- reading there was a 16 percentage point average increase from fall to spring and for math there was a 3 percentage point decrease from fall to spring.

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

Based on 2020-21 progress monitoring assessment data the greatest need for improvement is to demonstrate better student growth when it comes to math instruction and assessment. With having grade levels in overall math student averages either remain steady, have small growth overall, or show a decline from fall to spring we will need to revisit which math standards that students struggled with overall that was a contributing factor for not showing expected growth from fall to spring.

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

During 2020-21 there were changes during the first semester of school with students and teacher transitioning from online learning to brick and mortar learning so inconsistent instruction for math played a key role in not being able to show expected growth trends. To address this need for improvement all teacher and students will be in the building and will start of the year with consistent math instruction from day one. Also teacher PLCs will be vital in teacher collaboration in lesson planning, delivery, and analyzing student performance on grade level standards.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement was in the area of reading growth in 3rd grade and 5th grade. With both grade level showing double digit percentage average point increases from fall to spring is a positive component to build on.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement was identifying students who still struggled to read on grade level and develop small reading pullout groups that met at least twice a week with the reading coach and regional specialist beginning in January.

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

We will begin our 4-step process in September by using student baseline assessments to identify students based on pre-determined grade level assessment data for reading and math.

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.

Bi-Weekly PLCs, common planning, and monthly early dismissal professional development sessions with teachers and leadership team

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

The additional services that will be implemented this year is the addition of a standards coach to help assist with teacher planning and student intervention. Also SAI funds will be used to fund afterschool tutoring for students who are struggling with grade level standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Going into the 2021-22 school year, a main area of focus will be to continue to ensure teacher instruction and student learning are aligned to the standards. Having this focus will help us in reaching our reading and math goals that we establish for this year.

Measurable Outcome: Administration will be utilizing the Standards Walk-Through Tool to monitor teacher instruction that is aligned to the standards. Data will be collected and analyzed based on the identified areas of the tool and then shared with teachers during PLC's that will serve to further the collaborative conversation around instructional practices that are aligned to the standards.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored by the Standards Walk-Through Tool and CAST observations used by administrators. Plans for teachers to observe other grade level teachers in their use of whole group, small group, and one-on-one instructional practices that are aligned to the standard(s) being taught.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: During our PLC's, common planning, and early dismissal PD's we want to look at the following instructional practices and how teachers are utilizing them during instruction daily and discuss best practices that work for all of our students. Identifying standards covered and assessed throughout the year in our professional learning communities and making adjustments in our instructional practices. Teachers planning lessons and activities that are based on standards.

Whole group classroom explicit instruction
 Small group teacher led instruction
 One on One instruction (intervention)
 Research Based Interventions that are appropriate to the individual student's area of focus

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We want to be intentional on how students are engaging with the standards and instructional materials that are on grade level, so with that we need to make sure that our instructional practices are aligned with the appropriate grade level standards that our students are expected to learn. Due to the drop in grade level proficiency in reading and math across the district, we want to be intentional on how we monitor standards based instruction and fill in the learning gaps for our students who continue to struggle in reading and math on grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly Classroom walk through observations

PLC collaborative sessions bi-weekly

Title I funds will be utilized to fund a Reading Coach who will model best practices, monitor new standards implementation and provide support to the faculty through coaching cycles for new teachers to improve their standards aligned instruction that will support student achievement.

Title I funds will be utilized to fund a Paraprofessional that will provide assistance for small group

interventions to help promote student achievement in standards aligned instruction.

Title I funds will be utilized to provide student instructional supplies and materials to support student achievement

Person Responsible Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Classroom walk through observations (CAST and SWT)
PLC collaborative sessions bi-weekly

Person Responsible Katherine Kirkland (kirklandk@duvalschools.org)

#2. Other specifically relating to 5 Essentials/ Collaborative Teachers

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Building teacher to teacher trust through collaborative work that will happen during PLC and grade level common planning meetings.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase by 15 points on the Teacher Trust Section of the 5 Essential Survey in order to move out of the weak area into the strong area.

Monitoring: During PLCs, common planning, and early dismissal PD there will be designated time for teachers to share with one another and administration their goals, plans, and next steps on how they are engaging in the collaborative process with their colleagues across grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will work in grade level teams to foster consistent collaboration. Teachers will work together to be consistent in standards based instruction and monitor student data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Now that all faculty members will be back in building, face-to-face planning and collaborating will be essential to improving this area on the survey. Teachers along with the leadership team will be able to fully engage in the work of student achievement in which we will be able to foster that strong level of teacher to teacher trust and collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement

During pre-planning discussing this area of the 5-Essential survey and getting feedback from teachers on how this area can improve going forward and how this area can maintain a level of consistent practice as well.

Teacher surveys after PLCs, common planning, and early dismissal PDs that pertains to the collaborative process of each meeting.

Person Responsible Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

During pre-planning discussing this area of the 5-Essential survey and getting feedback from teachers on how this area can improve going forward and how this area can maintain a level of consistent practice as well.

Teacher surveys after PLCs, common planning, and early dismissal PDs that pertains to the collaborative process of each meeting.

Person Responsible Katherine Kirkland (kirklandk@duvalschools.org)

#3. 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 49%, 4th grade is 56%, and 5th grade is 47%.

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:

Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@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-intobig-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-progressmonitoring-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-teachingstrategies/>

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 Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@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 Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@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.

During the 2021-22 school year we will monitor school culture and climate through our PBIS Team. This year we want to focus on more positive behavior strategies and interventions to help reduce negative behavior in class and throughout the building. By establishing classroom rituals and routines that are consistent in measure will be the foundation of this priority.

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.

This year we are seeking more opportunities to engage with our families and community stakeholders to continue to allow them access into our daily school experience. Through our Parent and Families Engagement activities throughout the year we hope to re-establish the connection between home and school relationships and provide accurate information as it relates to student learning and achievement.

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

- School Advisory Council
- PTSA
- DCPS School Choice Office
- Faith Based Partners

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: Other: 5 Essentials/ Collaborative Teachers	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	----------------------