

Duval County Public Schools

# Alimacani Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Alimacani Elementary School

2051 SAN PABLO RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Robyn White**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (74%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Alimacani Elementary School

2051 SAN PABLO RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">30%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">37%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	A	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.**

Alimacani Elementary School is committed to providing a rigorous curriculum that inspires each learner to acquire knowledge in a safe environment. Alimacani implements standards-based best teaching educational practices that are imparted in an equitable manner in an effort to help each student realize their greatest level of academic, social, and physical achievement. Alimacani values the opportunity to foster relationships through communication among students, parents, educators, business partners and stakeholders.

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

Where education is a treasure and every child is inspired to reach for their dreams.

### 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
Stalls, Kathy	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and vision for the school. Responsible for maintaining a school that has a safe environment as well as quality instruction. Administers balanced budget, promotes a positive work environment, and involves community stakeholders and parents. Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, monitors the implementation of MTSS/Rtl, conducts assessment skills of school staff, ensures the implementation of intervention supports and documentation requirements, reviews student data, and meets with MTSS/Rtl members, communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities using the problem-solving model. The administrative team identifies the needs of students while working with district and school personnel to identify intervention strategies, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring processes, data collection and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development, and provides support for the administration of various assessments.
Kasper, Angela	Assistant Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, monitors the implementation of MTSS/Rtl, conducts assessment skills of school staff, ensures the implementation of intervention supports and documentation requirements, reviews student data, and meets with MTSS/Rtl members, communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities using the problem-solving model. The administrative team identifies the needs of students while working with district and school personnel to identify intervention strategies, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring processes, data collection and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development, and provides support for the administration of various assessments. Participates in collaborative planning with grade levels/content areas to ensure best practices and instructional delivery are of exceptional quality and student learning is the focus.
Bibb, Kendra	Assistant Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, monitors the implementation of MTSS/Rtl, conducts assessment skills of school staff, ensures the implementation of intervention supports and documentation requirements, reviews student data, and meets with MTSS/Rtl members, communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities using the problem-solving model. The administrative team identifies the needs of students while working with district and school personnel to identify intervention strategies, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring processes, data collection and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development, and provides support for the administration of various assessments. Participates in collaborative planning with grade levels/content areas to ensure best practices and instructional delivery are of exceptional quality and student learning is the focus.
Horn, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Collects, analyzes, and interprets school wide data to determine next steps for instruction. Provides support for individual classroom teachers in curriculum implementation, understanding academic content, use of instructional materials



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and strategies, coordinates common planning collaboration between grade levels/content areas.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/1/2021, Robyn White

**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.*

7

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

49

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

730

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

2

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

1

**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	140	133	112	127	120	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	750
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	2	0	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/23/2021

**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	138	131	116	126	119	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	756
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	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	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	0
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	138	131	116	126	119	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	756
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	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	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	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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				76%	50%	57%	78%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	56%	58%	64%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	50%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				88%	62%	63%	79%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				79%	63%	62%	75%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78%	52%	51%	52%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				85%	48%	53%	67%	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	81%	51%	30%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	50%	21%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	87%	61%	26%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	57%	28%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	81%	49%	32%	53%	28%
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 grade levels are: i-Ready Reading and Math, Achieve3000, PMA baselines, 1, 2, and 3 for Reading, Math and Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**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	59	53		53	35	27	38				
ELL	62	67		62	31		31				
ASN	85			77							
BLK	76			67							
HSP	75	71		66	48		52				
MUL	52			40							
WHT	86	70	64	81	84	69	81				
FRL	69	62		60	62		67				
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	51	55	55	65	73	74	65				
ELL	47	70		67	73						

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	88			82							
BLK	67	48		88	81	82	70				
HSP	74	64	71	79	79	79	81				
MUL	68	79		74	75						
WHT	78	61	43	92	78	80	90				
FRL	69	64	59	81	76	71	82				
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	46	54	36	50	65	52	38				
ELL	50	70		58	70						
ASN	75			75							
BLK	54	48		67	59		23				
HSP	72	69	69	74	86	67	86				
MUL	82	47		86	71						
WHT	82	68	56	81	76	50	73				
FRL	71	60	51	71	68	48	57				

**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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	555
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	



English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	81
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	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
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	76
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	64
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?

The lowest performance area overall was our BQ (lowest performing 25%) students in ELA at 56% which is up from 52% in 2019. The greatest decline from the prior year was in ELA proficiency. We went down only 2 points from 78 to 76 percent proficient. Even though we only went down 2 percentage points, we need to make sure our small group instruction is specifically targeted to increasing students' proficiency this year.

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

The lowest performance area overall was our BQ (lowest performing 25%) students in ELA at 56% which is up from 52% in 2019. . One of the contributing factors is that our small group instruction does not happen daily for all students due to Covid-19. Work to make sure small groups happen daily is a priority. The greatest decline from the prior year was in ELA proficiency. We went down only 2 points from 78 to 76 percent proficient. Even though we only went down 2 percentage points, we need to make sure our small group instruction is specifically targeted to increasing students' proficiency this year.

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

Covid-19 contributed to fewer small group instructions with teachers and students. Even though we wore masks, had desk shields, and took precautions for health and safety, we felt we could not safely hold small groups as much as we needed to.

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

Our fifth grade Science showed the most improvement +18 points from the previous year 85% proficiency this year. We had a former ELA 5th grade teacher dedicated to teaching Science for three classes which left the other teachers only having to prep for one subject area, Math. Another team continued with the same teacher teaching Math and Science to two classes.

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

We had a former ELA 5th grade teacher dedicated to teaching Science for three classes which left the other teachers only having to prep for one subject area, Math. Another team continued with the same teacher teaching Math and Science to two classes. We will have two new team members in fifth

grade teaching Science so making sure these teachers have time to collaborate with expert teachers on their grade level will help facilitate teaching and learning.

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

More focused professional development for teachers and collaborative planning focusing on the new BEST standards.

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

Teachers will participate in professional development for the new BEST standards and will have collaborative planning time to focus on targeted instruction that accelerates learning.

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

We will continue to focus on small group instruction in all subject areas to accelerate learning specifically to each child. Collaborative planning will be available with common grade levels to ensure focused instruction is happening in the classroom.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This area of focus was the lowest performing area so if we increase the monitoring of students with disabilities or lowest 25% of the school, then student outcome will improve.

**Measurable Outcome:** Monitor the following quarterly for this group of students:  
i-Ready Math and Reading, Reading benchmarks, Math benchmarks, Achieve3000, Science PMA's

**Monitoring:**

1. Support ESE/Grade Level Teachers through common planning with lesson studies to make sure lessons are aligned with the standards. (Administrators will conduct walk throughs to assess the teaching and learning in the classrooms).
2. Target the instruction to the student levels using LLI, Phonics for Reading, and other ESE supplement materials. Meet students at their level during small groups to push them forward to grade level standards. (Administrators will conduct walk throughs to assess the teaching and learning in the classrooms).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Support ESE/Grade Level Teachers through common planning with lesson studies to make sure lessons are aligned with the standards.
2. Target the instruction to the student levels using LLI, Phonics for Reading, and other ESE supplement materials. Meet students at their level during small groups to push them forward to grade level standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Support of planning with ESE/Grade Level Teachers will be important to help strengthen instructional practices through common planning with administration.
2. Teachers and teacher teams will use and analyze a variety of data to assess the effectiveness of instructional strategies then modify instruction if needed to continuously meet the needs of all students. Small group instruction must happen with all teachers to ensure focused teaching and learning is happening. Students must take ownership of their learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	At least 90% of all teachers will meet in content teams twice monthly to plan rigorous instructional delivery of standards-based tasks and assessments. Aligned instruction will include comparable experiences to the standards across the grade level. Data analysis shows that our lowest performing students need extra attention to the standards, therefore, teacher teams will collaborate twice monthly to plan instructional delivery models that have worked for student advancement. Teachers will monitor student progress monthly and make changes as needed.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	At least 90% of all teachers will meet in content teams twice monthly to plan rigorous instructional delivery of standards-based tasks and assessments. Aligned instruction will include comparable experiences to the standards across the grade level.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Administrators will have focused support in the areas of reading, math, and science. They will work one-on-one with teacher teams and content areas, complete coaching cycles and collaboratively plan with teachers to provide effective standards based instruction. K and 1 will implement the BEST standards beginning this school year, therefore, collaborative planning will involve analyzing data, unpacking standards, and student evidence of grade level learning.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	High quality professional development with teachers is among the most important and long standing challenges facing schools. Investing in on the job training offering time for high performing teachers to mentor newer teachers, and planning with high quality instructional leaders will develop high performing teachers.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Our school is not listed in this report.**