

Duval County Public Schools

Waterleaf Elementary



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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Brady Hewitt G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (62%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

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	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

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.

Waterleaf Elementary School develops inquisitive, independent thinkers and collaborative learners, who acquire the essential knowledge necessary to be career and college ready, and to be caring and creative contributors to the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Waterleaf Elementary School will foster an earnest passion for learning that inspires students to work with others in creating a better world for all.

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
Brady Hewitt, Lisa	Principal	
Montgomery, Tisa	Assistant Principal	
Kratz, Laura	School Counselor	
Witucki, Julie	Teacher, ESE	
Mickle, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
Kogan, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Gatehouse, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	
Roberts, Paige	Teacher, K-12	
	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/13/2021, Lisa Brady Hewitt G

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

682

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

7

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

7

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	0	113	124	119	111	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	7	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	4	2	7	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	9	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/13/2021

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	128	126	119	112	110	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Attendance below 90 percent	18	17	16	23	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	41	39	56	37	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	63	74	63	55	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287

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	41	44	49	39	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	128	126	119	112	110	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Attendance below 90 percent	18	17	16	23	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	41	39	56	37	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	63	74	63	55	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287

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	41	44	49	39	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				64%	50%	57%	66%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	56%	58%	58%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	50%	53%	40%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	62%	63%	75%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	63%	62%	60%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	51%	43%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				64%	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	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	50%	12%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1-5: i-Ready reading and math diagnostics; 5th grade Science: District PMA

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	38	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	29	41
	Students With Disabilities	16	26	42
	English Language Learners	10	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	26	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	24	39
	Students With Disabilities	21	28	42
	English Language Learners	14	0	14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	26	50

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	56	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	39	44
	Students With Disabilities	27	56	48
	English Language Learners	10	25	37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	34	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	24	34
	Students With Disabilities	11	3	59
	English Language Learners	12	12	12
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	34	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	17	20
	Students With Disabilities	17	25	36
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	24	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	23	28
	Students With Disabilities	4	23	39
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	25	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	28	18
	Students With Disabilities	17	23	18
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	16	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	12	37
	Students With Disabilities	11	22	36
	English Language Learners	17	14	14
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	29	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	24	18
	Students With Disabilities	22	30	32
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	28	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	24	41
	Students With Disabilities	24	30	50
	English Language Learners	0	0	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	55	52	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	45	30
	Students With Disabilities	54	59	43
	English Language Learners	0	100	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	39	45	44	50	52	57	27				
ELL	33			55							
ASN	63	67		70	75		67				
BLK	50	32		41	41		33				
HSP	56	56		68	50		67				
MUL	47			60							
WHT	67	67	70	77	74	80	58				
FRL	49	45	40	52	58	45	47				
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	30	44	27	40	46	34	39				
ELL	41	63	53	55	74	58	42				
ASN	76	58		90	71		73				
BLK	52	54	27	59	54	32	41				
HSP	58	59	50	58	67	50	53				
MUL	69	50		75	75						
WHT	67	64	50	74	61	53	74				
FRL	55	53	41	61	58	35	48				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	32	41	37	49	60	57	52				
ELL	40	42	33	60	37						
ASN	82	66		96	79		88				
BLK	52	43	35	50	43	35	37				
HSP	57	60	47	66	59	54	62				
MUL	68	69		82	53						
WHT	71	62	43	84	66	56	83				
FRL	55	50	38	64	56	41	58				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	44
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	68
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	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	57
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	54
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	70
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	46
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?

Proficiency in Reading went down in 4th and 5th grade. Proficiency in Math went down in 3rd and 4th grade. Science proficiency went down in Science in 5th grade. Reading proficiency in ESE is below 41%.

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

Bottom Quartile gains in math (38%) and Reading Proficiency in our ESE subgroup (34%).

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

Small group instruction with the ESE teacher needs to be targeted to the needs of the student.

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

5th grade math gains went from 51% to 62%. 5th grade math bottom quartile gains went from 25% to 38%. 5th grade reading bottom quartile gains went from 37% to 58%.

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

The 5th grade teachers were very strategic in their planning and use of small groups. We had 3 ESE teachers working with 5th grade and helping with Tier 2 and Tier 3 work.

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

A targeted approach to Tier 2 and Tier 3 work in Reading. All students will receive 40 minutes of targeted reading instruction during the school day. Instruction will be based on individual need. Assessments will be used to make decisions for instruction.

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.

K-2nd grade teachers will attend Benchmark curriculum training. ESE teachers and gen. education teachers who will service ESE students will take inclusion training. During PLC, grade levels will work on adjusting targeted reading groups based on assessments and progress monitoring. WOW days will be provided to each grade level to monitor assessments and growth.

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

40 minutes of targeted reading groups for all students. Teachers, paras, administration, and part-time tutors will be used to create small groups for targeted learning. Groups will be based on need and level to ensure instruction is specific.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities is a focus because we are below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities ESSA Federal Index will increase from 39% to 43%.
Monitoring:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth as assessed by running records, standards based grade level assessments, and blended learning. 2. Analyze data; create new groups; continue the process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD will receive intensive intervention through Rtl daily for a minimum of 30 minutes. Rtl will consist of small groups (2-5 students) and will use intervention materials based on individual need. This will be in addition to their IEP goals and their time spent with their ESE teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Rtl is research-based and, done with fidelity, will increase a student's growth. Criteria is based on scores on several assessments (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000, District Benchmarks, FSA). These are used to place students into intervention groups. Resources are materials provided by the district (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000; BAS; LLI; Phonics for Reading.)</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collect data from diagnostics in Aug. (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000; Benchmark assessments)
2. Analyze the data to form groups
3. Form groups based on individual need.
4. Schedule an Rtl block for each grade level and provide extra assistance to ensure small group size.
5. Implement Rtl.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Assessing student learning as students move through the standard. Formative assessment based on daily tasks, exit tickets, and student understanding of the material impacts instructional decisions and evidence of alignment of instruction, task, assessment. Assessing student Learning was identified via the Standards Walk-Through tool. Dials indicate a 2.2/5.0 for overall Assessing Student Learning; .44/1.0 for Determining Mastery; and .20/1.0 for FSA Alignment.
Measurable Outcome:	Assessing Student Learning will increase overall from 2.2 to 4.0 or higher. Sub-categories will increase by a minimum of .4 on each category.
Monitoring:	Analyze assessment data for the standard and make decisions for whole group/small group/individual remediation if necessary.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Learning Arc template will be used to align assessment to the standard to ensure the task can allow students to show mastery of the standard, or the part of the standard focused on; aligns with the standard; and is FSA aligned.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This specific strategy allows for professional learning when unpacking the standard. It creates an Arc for deeper knowledge of the standard, allowing teachers to instruct students on every aspect of the standard. By doing so, teachers will be able to create tasks and assessments that will align to FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC will be used to move through the first 4 steps of the learning arc. Unpacking the standard, understanding the vocabulary of the standard, utilizing resources, and breaking the standard down into objectives.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Common Planning to create/identify aligned tasks and assessment opportunities.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Analyze assessment data for the standard and make decisions for whole group/small group/individual remediation if necessary.

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Waterleaf 5th grade students scored 55% on the FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Waterleaf 5th grade students will increase the Science score from 55% to 68%.**Monitoring:**

1. Monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth as assessed by District PMA's, standards based grade level assessments, unit assessments.
2. Analyze data; create plans based on the data; continue the process.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

45 minutes-1 hour of time will be spent on Science daily.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Students will have more time dedicated to learning the science concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC and monthly meeting will be held with the District Science Specialist.

Person Responsible

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Data from the district Science PMAs will be disaggregated and small groups will be made based on needs data.

Person Responsible

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

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

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

o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 31%, 4th grade is 55%, and 5th grade is 42%.

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:

Lisa Brady Hewitt (brady1@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 Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@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 Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@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.

Waterleaf's discipline data indicates the current school ranking as #1/Very Low compared to elementary schools statewide. Waterleaf will continue to implement effective Positive Behavior Intervention Supports, align professional development with teaching and learning goals, collaborate with stakeholders to ensure understanding of school goals, and consistently check the pulse as systems are implemented.

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.

Positive school culture is built through our daily announcements, monthly student of the month activities, positive reinforcements for daily activities, community events such as Book Fair, Carnival, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, Chorus, school play, positive referrals, and Girls On the Run.

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

Stakeholders are invited monthly to the School Advisory Council meetings. Vision, mission, and School Improvement Plans are discussed and amended as needed with input from parents, students, faculty, and community participants.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

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