

Duval County Public Schools

Fort Caroline Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Fort Caroline Elementary School

3925 ATHORE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32277

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

Demographics

Principal: Carlene Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2021

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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Fort Caroline Elementary School

3925 ATHORE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32277

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

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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

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

The educators at Fort Caroline Elementary are committed to providing high quality educational opportunities that will inspire all students to acquire and use the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in a global economy and culturally diverse world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The educators at Fort Caroline Elementary will challenge each child by meeting his/her individual needs and motivate them to meet a higher academic standard.

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
Stovall, Violet	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader, leads the school in data analysis, instructional improvements including school safety and works as a support system to all faculty, staff and students and all stakeholders at Fort Caroline Elementary.
Parker, Kanzla	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as an instructional leader, leads the school in data analysis, instructional improvements including school safety and works as a support system to all faculty, staff and students and all stakeholders at Fort Caroline Elementary.
	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/25/2021, Carlene Smith

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

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

600

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.

38

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	114	79	95	103	101	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	584
Attendance below 90 percent	4	38	59	59	50	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	4	2	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	4	2	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	32	31	29	51	55	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	259

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	4	2	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

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	32	103	101	102	104	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	56	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	34	73	67	52	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269

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

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	32	103	101	102	104	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	0	56	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	34	73	67	52	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269

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	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				45%	50%	57%	41%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	58%	60%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	50%	53%	62%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	62%	63%	53%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	63%	62%	63%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	52%	51%	44%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	48%	53%	46%	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	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	57%	3%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used were iReady diagnostic and PMA assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	20	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	16	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	13	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	10	36
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	2
	English Language Learners	1	0	1

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	27	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	23	31
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	17	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	16	22
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	2
	English Language Learners	0	1	1
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	31	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	24	26
	Students With Disabilities	1	2	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	38	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	31	30
	Students With Disabilities	5	4	2
	English Language Learners	0	1	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	38	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	31	30
	Students With Disabilities	5	4	2
	English Language Learners	0	1	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	40	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	28	22
	Students With Disabilities	6	5	3
	English Language Learners	2	1	1
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	31	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	25	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	23	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	17	21
	Students With Disabilities	2	1	2
	English Language Learners	1	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	38	39	32
	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	17	33		20	27	20	14				
ELL	25			48							
BLK	29	49	67	37	41	31	22				
HSP	20			30							
MUL	45			54							
WHT	35			58							
FRL	27	43	62	38	33	27	25				
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	27	50		50	68						
ELL	23	36		54	64						
BLK	42	55	69	63	66	42	37				
HSP	40	71		60	82		45				
WHT	55	68		74	82						
FRL	43	58	74	62	72	50	34				
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	33	67		34	67		18				
ELL		50	50		60						
BLK	34	54	63	50	60	41	42				
HSP	52	78		55	67		60				
WHT	64	81		67	75						
FRL	39	58	61	51	64	47	42				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	39
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	25
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	50
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	
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	47
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Based on the data from the 2021 state assessments, there was a decline with all subgroups, grade levels and in all content areas.

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

Based on iReady data and 2019 state assessments, the students in the Lowest Performing Quartile in Math showed the lowest performance. The decrease in LPQ Math performance has occurred over the last two years. In mathematics, 61% below or approaching proficiency in Numbers and Operations, 66% in Geometry, and 66% in Measurement and Data. A contributing factor was the lack of consistent effective small group instruction with focus and remediation on specific skills and standards.

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

The new actions in place for school year 2021-2022, will consist of consistent small focused groups meeting daily with Interventionists, Paras, Media Specialist, early tutoring and fluid targeted student groupings. Walk through classroom visits will focus on Standards based instruction with consistent feedback provided to support instruction.

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

Based on 2019 State Assessment data, the area that showed the most improvement was ELA Lowest Performing Quartile Learning Gains.

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

The contributing factors to the improvement was focused push in support, implementation of Corrective intervention, LLI, tutoring, Interventionist and Media Specialist support. LPQ students were invited to participate in after school tutoring in October-December, with an emphasis on deficient standards from PMA and Module Assessments.

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

- Effective Implementation of Acaletics, Corrective Reading
 - Weekly collaborative lesson planning during PLC with Interventionist/Specialist (Reading & Math) or teacher lead.
 - LPQ Reading/Math students will participate in Rti Wednesdays with a designated Resource teacher and or classroom teacher/administrator with focus of Reading/Math Priority Standards
 - PLC's will meet weekly to ensure instruction is aligned to standards
 - Bi weekly meetings with the Moving Up Club (LPQ students) to have data chats to set goals and provide additional instructional support.
 - Teachers and Admin meet to analyze assessment data to determine Tier 2 instructional focus for Reading/Math and Science
 - Morning tutoring from 7:45 – 8:30 for select LPQ students
 - Morning Blended Learning in the Computer Lab
 - Monthly incentives for academic performance on assessments (Acaletics, Achieve, Study Island, iReady, Module, PMA).
- Fifth grade students will participate in Sea World trip to enhance Science instruction and Science Standards.
- Para Professionals, resource teachers and volunteers work with LPQ students (remediation of standards) during core and centers.
 - Develop FCIM calendar of instruction of priority Math/Reading/Science Standards based on individual student needs starting in October
 - Morning tutoring during breakfast for select 4th & 5th grade students

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 participate in weekly Common Planning with a focus on planning for Standards Based Instruction.
- *Teachers will participate in differentiated In service trainings on Early Dismissal days.

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

The school leadership team will address:

- *Weekly standards based lesson planning with Instructional Coach, Administrator, Specialist or teacher lead.
- LPQ students to participate in after school tutoring in October-December, with an emphasis on deficient standards from Baseline, PMA and Module Assessments
- Students will participate in after school and Saturday tutoring (Math/Science)

- Instructional Paras and classroom teachers with continual focus of remediating Math Priority Standards and Science.
- Weekly Common Planning and Early Dismissal PLC's will meet to collaborate with Instructional Coaches and Interventionists to plan for instruction that is aligned to standards
- Instructional Paras will work to remediate Science Standards during small group instruction
- Media Specialist will support Science remediation and instruction during the Media block.
- LPQ Math students participate in Rti Wednesdays with a designated Resource teacher.
- * LLI and DI materials will be used as reading interventions with LPQ students during small group instruction.
- '• Administrator-Student monthly data chats with LPQ students to review student data and academic goals to provide additional instructional support.
- *Implement Tier 2 instruction using resources from the iReady Math/Reading toolkit
- Teachers and Administrators will meet regularly to analyze assessment data to determine Tier 2 instructional focus.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practices specifically relating to Standards-aligned instruction will start with standards focused Common Planning sessions. Common planning will be dedicated to engaging teachers in planning that will ensure effective standards aligned instruction is planned and implemented. Focused Common Planning sessions will ensure teachers implement instructional practices so students are aware of what they are expected to learn in relation to the standard. Based on the Standards Walk Through Tool, less than 40% of the classrooms observed used the posted standard to guide student learning. Effective planning for instructional practices will enhance students understanding of what they are expected to learn.
Measurable Outcome:	If effective Standards Focused Common Planning occurs weekly with teachers, then observations in 90% of classrooms visited using the Standards Walk Through Tool, will employ deep student conversations of understanding the standard, alignment of student tasks, assessments and materials will be aligned to the standard.
Monitoring:	The district's walk through tool, informal and formal observations will be used to observe teacher's implementation of standard's based instructional practices. Area of focus will also include Weekly monitoring of student use of Ready, Freckle, Acaletics, Achieve 3000 and Study Island.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective teacher planning and collaboration of unpacking and analyzing the standards for aligned instruction is the strategy implemented for this area of focus. Based on the Standards Walkthrough Tool, admin can measure the effectiveness of planning sessions from observations of student understanding of the standard and learning tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher collaboration during planning and analyzing and unpacking of the standards will ensure clarity of the language and complexity of the standards to enhance student learning and performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly Standards Focused Common Planning sessions. The standard is the focus of all common planning sessions. Teacher conversations and planning will center around the implementation of instruction, the tasks, assessment and ensuring materials are selected that align. Students will also use the technology based programs iReady, Achieve, Freckles and Study Island to enhance their learning. Teachers will be able to assign lessons that are aligned. Laptops will be assigned to classrooms.

Person Responsible Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning sessions, teachers participate and collaborate in dialogue that is consistent and standards focused with administrators. Teachers submit the Standards Based Common Planning document weekly to administrators to include all indicators aligned with the Walk Through form are included.

Person Responsible Alicia Addison (addisona@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will meet weekly to discuss alignment findings of classroom observations. The Standards Based Common Planning document will be used to follow up implementation of instruction using the Standards Walk Through Tool with administration.

Person Responsible Kanzla Parker (parkerk4@duvalschools.org)

The administrators will meet regularly to calibrate classroom observations using the Standards Based Walk Through tool across all grade levels and content areas observed. Observations will include student understanding of the task and their performance on assessments, exit tickets, etc.

Person Responsible Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The 5Essentials data for Fort Caroline Elementary shows a decline from the previous year in the 5Essential category of “Collaborative Teachers”, under the measure of “Quality Professional Development”. In schools with strong Collaborative Teachers, all teachers collaborate to promote professional growth. Based on a comparison to the benchmark, an mScore of 37 means that Fort Caroline Elementary School is weak on this measure.

Measurable Outcome:

In schools with strong Professional Development, PD is rigorous and focused on student learning. Teachers will provide input into their Professional Learning and the Benchmark Measure of Quality Professional Development on the 5Essentials survey will increase by 50%.

Monitoring:

Implementation of teachers Professional Learning will be monitored through walk-throughs and classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The district's Walk-Through form will be used to follow up with implementation of Professional Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The district Walk-through tool will provide data on the implementation of teacher's Standards focused instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement weekly walk through visits to classrooms to observe standards instructional practices. Look fors will include Focus Board, standards aligned instruction, tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible Violet Stovall (stovallv@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 67%, 4th grade is 84%, and 5th grade is 64%.

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:

Violet Stovall (stovallv@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 Violet Stovall (stovallv@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 Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Violet Stovall (stovallv@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.

The data listed in the report does not align with the school's discipline data. The school will implement the following:

- *Discipline assemblies will take place quarterly to include bus safety and safety procedures commuting to and from school to ensure students feel safe.**
- The PBIS team will meet monthly to develop plans for a supportive and fulfilling school environment with conditions that are conducive to learning and meet the needs of all students and staff.**
- *CHAMP's procedures implemented throughout the school.**

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.

Fort Caroline Elementary plans to build a positive school culture and environment by:

- Providing activities to engage parents, family members and the community in learning that will promote student academic and social growth.
- Teachers will facilitate daily Social Emotion Learning lessons for students to acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel, and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships and make responsible decisions.
- Discipline assemblies will take place quarterly to include bus safety and safety procedures commuting to and from school to ensure students feel safe.
- The PBIS team will meet monthly to develop plans for a supportive and fulfilling school environment with conditions that are conducive to learning and meet the needs of all students and staff.
- The school will partner with surrounding businesses, volunteers, non-profits, and stakeholders to bring positive, measurable change to the school.
- The core Leadership Team will meet weekly to develop plans to improve and integrate data, systems, and practices to positively affect student academic outcomes.
- The school will pair new teachers with a novice teacher as their peer teacher to plan, collaborate and provide guidance as a new teacher,

- The administrators will celebrate staff birthdays and provide tangible incentives throughout the year for all staff to enhance staff morale and positive school culture.

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

Principal - School's Leader will lead and model efforts to create a positive school culture by engaging all stakeholders.
Assistant Principal - School's Leader will assist with leading and modeling efforts to create a positive school culture.
School Counselor - Counselor will facilitate weekly lessons on Character Education.
Classroom Teachers - Classroom teachers will implement SEL lessons daily with students to acquire attitudes and skills to manage emotions.
PBIS Team - PBIS Team will develop schoolwide plans to support positive school environment to enhance student learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00