Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School

8000 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

http://www.duvalschools.org/tlae

Demographics

Principal: Julie Ehrenberg

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	83%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%)
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

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School

8000 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

http://www.duvalschools.org/tlae

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Twin Lakes Academy Elementary we foster a sense of leadership in all of our students. We want our students to focus on becoming lifelong learners and seek to excel in all endeavors which will lead to achieving their dreams.

Wildcats LEAD: Learn, Excel, Achieve, Dream

Provide the school's vision statement.

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary is working together to Create Leaders for Life!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Robertson, Denise	Principal	Principal Denise Robertson leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. She leads observations, evaluations, professional development and data reviews. Mrs. Robertson works with PTA, SAC, Shared Decision making, and the MTSS Team.
Jones, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Melissa Jones coordinates testing, computer-based instruction programs and compiles data from Performance Matters. She leads discipline and parent relations for grades K-5. Ms. Jones coordinates SAC and serves on Shared Decision Making and MTSS. She coordinates SIP goals, conducts focus walks and observations, provides professional development and coaching to teachers.
Stoker, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Amanda Stoker coordinates attendance meetings and student scheduling, serves as textbook manager, and coordinates teacher and staff duties. She leads discipline and parent relations for grades K-5. Ms. Stoker serves on SAC, Shared Decision Making, and MTSS. She coordinates PBIS goals, conducts focus walks and observations, and provides professional development and coaching to teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2008, Julie Ehrenberg

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

3

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

855

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

6

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

6

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	138	117	134	152	141	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	838
Attendance below 90 percent	3	41	32	47	47	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	3	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	2	2	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	20	40	54	52	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	35	54	71	76	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	314
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	3	31	41	57	63	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272

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	3	2	3	4	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

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	149	159	133	151	169	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	926
Attendance below 90 percent	22	12	14	8	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	48	69	76	51	47	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	347
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	70	105	0	103	80	39	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	445

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	48	65	71	46	30	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	149	159	133	151	169	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	926
Attendance below 90 percent	22	12	14	8	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	48	69	76	51	47	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	347
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	70	105	0	103	80	39	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	445

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	48	65	71	46	30	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				55%	50%	57%	57%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	58%	55%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	50%	53%	51%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	62%	63%	65%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	63%	62%	61%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	52%	51%	33%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	48%	53%	62%	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	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	50%	6%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

1st-2nd grade use iReady for Reading and Math Progress Monitoring.
3rd-5th grade use district created Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/28%	60/44%	88/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/29%	29/46%	38/62%
	Students With Disabilities	4/21%	3/17%	9/45%
	English Language Learners	2/14%	1/9%	2/13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/16%	38/28%	76/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/12%	17/27%	31/51%
	Students With Disabilities	3/16%	3/17%	11/55%
	English Language Learners	3/21%	2/18%	3/20%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/41%	79/52%	104/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/36%	33/47%	43/57%
	Students With Disabilities	7/37%	6/30%	8/36%
	English Language Learners	3/16%	2/11%	5/25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/20%	41/29%	81/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/14%	12/18%	27/36%
	Students With Disabilities	6/32%	6/32%	10/45%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	1/6%	5/25%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49/37%	66/48%	61/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/38%	30/45%	30/42%
	Students With Disabilities	4/21%	6/30%	5/26%
	English Language Learners	4/21%	4/21%	5/24%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59/46%	59/44%	51/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/51%	28/42%	24/36%
	Students With Disabilities	7/37%	5/25%	6/30%
	English Language Learners	5/28%	6/33%	7/33%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54/45%	69/52%	58/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/38%	25/48%	22/55%
	Students With Disabilities	3/20%	4/21%	3/20%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	80/62%	70/53%	58/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/57%	25/47%	19/51%
	Students With Disabilities	8/50%	7/37%	4/27%
	English Language Learners	1/13%	2/22%	2/29%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67/47%	70/50%	56/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/38%	25/45%	22/44%
	Students With Disabilities	3/16%	4/22%	2/12%
	English Language Learners	3/15%	2/11%	4/24%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63/44%	55/39%	39/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/40%	17/31%	14/27%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	1/6%	1/6%
	English Language Learners	4/21%	3/18%	2/12%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75/45%	78/55%	61/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/56%	31/57%	24/47%
	Students With Disabilities	5/28%	4/22%	3/18%
	English Language Learners	6/32%	5/29%	4/24%

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	18	44		27	31		6				
ELL	22	32	20	32	37	27	22				
ASN	68	58		68	33		58				
BLK	37	49	40	30	30	10	31				
HSP	38	50	54	41	41	42	36				
MUL	41			50							
WHT	62	74		65	52		58				
FRL	42	49		41	31	15	33				
	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	28	44	50	43	44	31	31				
ELL	26	38	24	43	58	31					

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	79	81		83	94						
BLK	41	41	52	57	55	27	46				
HSP	51	60	27	69	67	35	74				
MUL	57	56		76	67						
WHT	71	59	55	81	67		74				
FRL	42	50	52	61	60	34	56				
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	26	46	41	30	40	29	17				
ELL	26	56	69	43	53	45					
ASN	79	70		83	60		71				
BLK	41	52	54	47	50	33	46				
HSP	56	52	54	60	59		47				
MUL	67	39		79	72		75				
WHT	68	60	43	79	70	33	79				
FRL	48	48	53	53	54	33	48				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	329
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	57
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	32
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	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	62
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	40
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?

Students with Disabilities
Disproportionate number of ESE teachers to service identified students with disabilities.
Lack of experience (teachers) to provide effective Tier II and Tier III instruction to identified and non-identified students with disabilities.

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

English Language Learners
Increased number of students identified via WIDA testing with no increase in services or support.
Increased number of students enrolling that have no previous school experience.

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

Math students in our Lowest Performing Quartile.
Lack of differentiation of instruction for identified students. Low attendance of LPQ (2 or more EWS).
Lack of prerequisite skills or content knowledge (identified students).

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

Math Proficiency and Learning Gains.
Instruction implemented with fidelity. Strong Core Instruction. Differentiated small group instruction/interventions to address deficits.

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

Instruction implemented with fidelity. Strong Core Instruction. Differentiated small group instruction/interventions to address deficits.

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

1. Intentional scaffolding
2. Building knowledge and vocabulary
3. Prioritizing standards
4. Modifying guided reading
5. Diagnosing essential missed learning

6. Utilizing Interdependent Collaborative Support Teams
7. Incorporating text sets

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.

1 Strategic Collaborative Planning
2. Vertical Articulation and Planning
3. PD- Guided Reading and Teacher-led small group instruction
4. Grade Level Data Chats to diagnose and identify essential missed learning

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

Partnership with "sister" schools to continue professional learning opportunity
Focus walks to observe/debrief

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELL population has consistently increased from 5% in 2018 to over 12% in 2020.The percentage of students with no prior schooling has significantly increased and this creates a challenge to effectively meet their academic needs. The majority of these students fall into the Lowest Performing Quartile and this contributes to the overall decline in performance of the LPQ.
Measurable Outcome:	By 2021-2022 increase the overall Federal Index for English Language Learners from 40% to 41%.
Monitoring:	Quarterly monitoring of grades, attendance, and classroom performance. Quarterly data chats with teachers focused on formative/summative assessments and classwork.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement culturally responsive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Wrap around support needed for all ELL students that will meet the academic and social emotional needs of the students. It allows administration to strategically support teachers, staff, students, and families.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategically schedule ELL students

Person Responsible	Amanda Stoker (stokera@duvalschools.org)

2. Utilize District ESOL Department to facilitate and support professional development of teachers.

Person Responsible	Amanda Stoker (stokera@duvalschools.org)

3. Strategic scheduling of ESOL Paras to support ELL students and teachers.

Person Responsible	Amanda Stoker (stokera@duvalschools.org)

4. Quarterly progress monitoring of ELL students.

Person Responsible	Amanda Stoker (stokera@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The majority of these students fall into the Lowest Performing Quartile and this contributes to the overall decline in performance of the LPQ.
Measurable Outcome:	By 2021-2022 increase the overall Federal Index for Students with Disabilities from 39% to 41%.
Monitoring:	Quarterly monitoring of grades and attendance. Quarterly data chats with teachers focusing on formative/summative assessments and classroom performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement research-based targeted instructional strategies to increase academic achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Wrap around support needed for all Students with Disabilities that will meet the academic and social emotional needs of the students. It allows administration to strategically support teachers, staff, students, and families.

Action Steps to Implement	
1. Teach in small interactive groups.	
Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
2. Instruct and assess learning in multiple ways.	
Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
3. Arrange classrooms for maximizing attention.	
Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
4. Use formal systems for behavioral and social-emotional change.	
Person Responsible	Cristina Seiler Seiler (lopezseilerc@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the results of the 5 Essentials Survey, we need to focus on strengthening relationships among all stakeholders. This includes improving communication, enhancing the community to build a sense of trust, strengthening the relationships among colleagues, and participating in reflective dialogue focused on student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	By 2021-2022 increase the overall category of Collective Responsibility (5 Essentials Survey) from 16% to 25%. By 2021-2022 increase the overall category of Teacher-Principal Trust (5 Essentials Survey) from 50% to 60%. By 2021-2022 increase the overall category of Collaborative Practices (5 Essentials Survey) from 38% to 48%. By 2021-2022 increase the overall category of School Commitment (5 Essentials Survey) from 38% to 45%. By 2021-2022 increase the overall category of Teacher-Parent Trust (5 Essentials Survey) from 40% to 50%.
Monitoring:	Agendas for Professional Learning Communities Meeting Minutes for Professional Learning Communities Teacher's Lesson Plans that reflect discussions had in Professional Learning Communities
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Create a professional learning community that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the results of the 5 Essentials Survey and subsequent stakeholders focus groups, stakeholders expressed a need for a more collaborative culture where trusted relationships can grow, flourish, and impact student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Quarterly Culture Talks between Principal and Teachers/Staff

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Learning communities convene regularly and frequently during the workday to engage in collaborative professional learning to strengthen their practice and increase student results.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Learning community members are accountable to one another to achieve the shared goals of the school and school system and work in transparent, authentic settings that support their improvement.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Monthly What's Up Wednesdays with the Principal - this is a time where faculty and staff members can discuss anything with the Principal

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the results of the 5 Essentials Survey, we need to enhance the feeling of safety among students.
Measurable Outcome:	By 2021-2022 increase the overall category of Student Safety (5 Essentials Survey) from 26% to 36%.
Monitoring:	Lesson plans from the school counselor indicating social/emotional learning taking place in classrooms. Lesson plans from the teachers indicating social/emotional learning taking place in classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide students with the academic, emotional, and social skills necessary to improve their feelings of safety.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on 5 Essentials Student Focus Group, students voiced their concerns and misconceptions on school safety.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement Sanford Harmony in all classrooms.

Person Responsible	Amanda Stoker (stokera@duvalschools.org)

Implement the Calm Classroom curriculum in all classrooms.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

The school counselor will implement Child Safety Matters lessons in all classrooms.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based upon the 2020-2021 Standards Walk Through Tool data, 68% of classrooms show Standards-aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. The Standards-Based School Continuum (moderate rating in both Standards- based Planning and Aligned Observations) validates the results of the Standards Walk Through Tool. According to the 2020 5 Essentials Survey, teachers rate their Collaborative Practices as Weak (38), which is an 11 point decline in one year.
Measurable Outcome:	80% of classrooms observed will indicate standards alignment of instruction, tasks, and assessments, utilizing learning arcs, as measured by the Standards Walk Through Tool by January 2022. 90% of classrooms observed will indicate standards alignment of instruction, tasks, and assessments, utilizing learning arcs, as measured by the Standards Walk Through Tool by April 2022.
Monitoring:	Data collected by the Standards Walk Through Tool used by administrators.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Build a culture of standards-based instruction, with all content areas teachers, through focused common planning, utilizing Learning Arcs, that aligns materials, tasks, and assessments as evidenced in the Standards Walk Through tool.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The culture of standards-based focused practices and incorporation of the Learning Arcs is key to the alignment of instruction, tasks, and assessments that impact student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize student work to facilitate deep conversation around the standards and Learning Arcs that impact instruction, tasks, and assessments.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Conduct frequent Standards Walk Throughs to produce actionable next steps and provide actionable and specific feedback to teachers following each classroom observation and common planning session.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Follow through in grade level common planning and quarterly data dives to monitor the effectiveness of tasks, materials, and assessments.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Identify and use (grade level/content area) teacher leaders to create a sense of ownership by facilitating standards based common planning.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Calibrate with Assistant Principals to ensure a deeper understanding of Learning Arc, standards implementation, and evidence in both teacher actions and student work.

Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

#6. 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 62%, 4th grade is 56%, and 5th grade is 54%. 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:	Denise Robertson (robertsond@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   Denise Robertson (robertsond@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   Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible   Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

In comparison across the state, our school ranked very low (#1 rank in the county and state) in discipline data. We currently have no areas of concern. However, we are going to continue to implement a variety of social emotional learning curriculums across all grade levels to promote mental and academic health for all students.

Specifically, we will work on the following items.
1. Invites business and faith-based partners to meet with school admin team to discuss ways in which our partnerships can strengthen our relationships and communication.
2. Develop a plan through which teachers are more supportive of student needs through class meetings and daily Sanford Harmony Meet Ups and Calm Classroom sessions.
3. Review and enhance all modes of parent communication including but not limited to Blackboard, Agenda Planners, Calss Dojo, and Social Media.

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.

Parents are welcome at all times. Simply put: families make the difference. We have a very strong core group of PTA and SAC. They are involved in initiatives with teachers that impact our students. Initiatives such as the Penguin patch, Every Drop Counts Fundraiser, BINGO Night, Mothers' Day Cake, Book Fairs, Yearbook, and the School Dance.

We see building strong, positive relationships and maintaining transparency as the core foundation of our school culture. This is established and maintained through our school-wide implementation of Covey's 7 Habits, Sanford Harmony, Calm Classroom, and Growth Mindset. Paramount in our effort to maintain transparency with all stakeholders, we utilize all forms of social media; including Facebook, school website, Twitter, Weekly Principal email/voice/text messaging through Duval Connect, and school DoJo. Our goal for all staff in our school is to foster positive relationships with students and among peers maintaining our positive climate and culture through continuous communication and collaboration. These include rewarding good behavior with "pawsitive" awards, Meet Ups/Buddy Ups, and Buddy Classes (pairing primary and intermediate classrooms).

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

Students/Faculty: As a Leadership school, we provide multiple opportunities for students such as Girls on the Run, TECHNOCATS (broadcasting), Safety Patrols, Yearbook Club, Green Team, Teachers of Tomorrow, Peer Mediators, Student Council, and the Lighthouse Student Leadership Team.

Parents/Faculty/Community Partners/Students: SAC plays an integral role in the development of school improvement initiatives. SAC is comprised of active community members, parents, school representatives, and faith-based partners. This team provides valuable input into safety decisions, budgetary decisions, and overall school improvement. Monthly meetings are conducted which includes the Annual Mid- Year Stakeholders' Meeting that delves deeply into student achievement data.

Input is gathered from students, staff, parents through surveys and focus groups. Focus groups include our quarterly Staff Culture Talks, 5 Essentials Survey Focus Group with students, 5 Essentials Survey Focus Groups with teachers, and parents/school community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00