

Duval County Public Schools

Oceanway 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	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

Oceanway Elementary School

12555 GILLESPIE AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Gray

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	82%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Oceanway Elementary School

12555 GILLESPIE AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

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	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

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.

To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gray, Jennifer	Principal	Instructional Leadership, Staff Development, Student Discipline, Culture and Climate, Building Management, Facilities Operation, Staff, Student and Parent Advocate, Business and Community Partnerships, Title I Planning and Implementation, Supervision and Instruction
Ehrenberg, Julie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership, Staff Development, Student Discipline, Culture and Climate, Building Management, Facilities Operation, Staff, Student and Parent Advocate, Business and Community Partnerships, Title I Planning and Implementation, Supervision and Instruction
Johnson, Keith	Instructional Coach	Math Coach, providing instructional support and job-embedded professional development for staff, as well as providing instructional support for students
Pipkin, Barbara	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, providing instructional support and job-embedded professional development for staff, as well as providing instructional support for students
	School Counselor	Student and Family Advocate, Social and Emotional support, Exceptional Student Education liaison and designee, English Language Learner liaison and designee, Ambassador for Goodness and Well-being for students and staff, Partner Management and Resource Facilitator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Jennifer Gray

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.*

6

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.*

31

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

611

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.

2

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	67	78	99	101	88	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541
Attendance below 90 percent	1	23	32	28	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	6	44	46	15	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	10	28	41	23	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
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	1	9	37	39	19	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/12/2021

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	100	105	87	99	101	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	31	21	25	28	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	36	66	46	47	21	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	43	71	56	55	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260

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	35	57	47	42	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213

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

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	100	105	87	99	101	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	31	21	25	28	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	36	66	46	47	21	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	43	71	56	55	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260

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	35	57	47	42	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213

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

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				56%	50%	57%	55%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	56%	58%	54%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	50%	53%	42%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	62%	63%	68%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	63%	62%	61%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	52%	51%	39%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	48%	53%	57%	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	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready and PMA Data

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18/19%	27/31%	40/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/18%	13/25%	20/36%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/25%	6/38%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/6%	21/24%	54/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/3%	8/15%	32/58%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/25%	11/69%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21/19%	49/47%	55/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/16%	20/37%	28/53%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	3/17%	3/17%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/6%	31/30%	57/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/6%	12/23%	29/55%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/11%	3/17%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39/44%	40/44%	47/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/38%	21/37%	26/46%
	Students With Disabilities	5/26%	5/28%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	1/33%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53/60%	55/61%	52/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/60%	28/50%	30/57%
	Students With Disabilities	10/59%	7/39%	5/31%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/33%	1/33%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27/33%	40/47%	40/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/27%	23/46%	24/48%
	Students With Disabilities	6/25%	7/29%	5/21%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	1/33%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38/47%	36/42%	40/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/48%	19/38%	23/49%
	Students With Disabilities	7/29%	6/25%	5/22%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	1/33%	2/67%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/37%	49/48%	56/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/31%	20/38%	20/47%
	Students With Disabilities	5/17%	7/23%	11/39%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/67%	1/33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43/46%	44/44%	44/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/42%	17/33%	18/42%
	Students With Disabilities	9/30%	6/21%	7/25%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	2/67%	0/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47/48%	54/52%	54/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/38%	24/46%	23/53%
	Students With Disabilities	8/27%	11/37%	11/39%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	2/67%	1/33%

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	22	24		33	33		29				
ELL											
BLK	46	53		58	40		48				
HSP	56			65			45				
WHT	44	41	33	57	50	14	56				
FRL	42	35	36	51	33		37				
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	24	42	30	45	46	23	14				
BLK	54	59	54	68	55	31	38				
HSP	65	62		78	77						
WHT	54	61	57	71	68	42	55				

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
FRL	50	62	59	69	64	47	55				
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	24	35	38	45	46	30	20				
BLK	52	50		67	60		44				
HSP	50	40		60							
MUL	53	54		67	69						
WHT	56	56	40	68	60	36	59				
FRL	52	54	43	66	62	44	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	73
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	
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	49
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	55
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	42
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	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup data points continue to show the lowest performance rates. This subgroup has significant academic deficiencies and many are working 2 or more grade levels below their current placement.

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

Our greatest gap was our Lowest Performing Quartile in Math in the previous accountability cycle. Oceanway Elementary was at 38% and the state was at 51%. Science proficiency in the previous year showed the greatest decline. As there was no statewide testing for the previous year, this data point continues to be a focal point. Our 5th grade students in the previous year were 4% lower in reading proficiency than our 5th grade students from the previous year. Reading proficiency is typically aligned to science data, and therefore must be a shared focus for the upcoming school year to address this need.

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

Our Math LPQ has been below the state average for multiple years. This is an area of increased focus. The continued use of Acaletics, as well as tracking student data monthly in order to assess effectiveness of instruction and curriculum will be critical throughout the year. Many of our students have significant gaps in their learning and while they are making incremental growth, it is not covering the content and ground needed to get students on grade level and ready for upcoming standards.

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

Our Lowest Performing Quartile in ELA showed the largest growth with an increase of 17 points in the previous accountability cycle.

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

Our school had a priority focus on these students, and we were intentional with our actions last year. All of our ELA LPQ students received intervention in either Phonics for Reading or LLI, based upon their individual needs.

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

Continue with the strategies listed above focusing on student needs.

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.

Professional development and PLC's

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

Add an additional instructional coach to continue to target needs. Continue with quarterly data chats to progress monitor students and provide necessary interventions for improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Standards walk data indicates students struggling to articulate their understanding of the standard as it relates to what they are learning, that tasks are not consistently aligned to the level of rigor or depth to cover the identified standard, and do not consistently require students to display mastery of the entire standard or grade level appropriate component. In contrast, observations indicate that the teacher instruction does consistently match the rigor and depth of the identified standard, but when it is released to students, the same rigor and depth is not observed. This is negatively impacting our student's learning and mastery of grade level standards and expectations, as they are not being required to demonstrate mastery of such consistently through analysis and application.

Measurable Outcome:

Across all grade levels and content areas, 85% of completed standards walks will result in a final rating of 1.5 or higher when rating if students are determining the mastery of the standard or grade level component through completing activities/tasks that display mastery of the entire standard or an appropriate grade-level component.

Monitoring:

The admin team will conduct weekly Standards Walkthroughs to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Learning Communities will be utilized to provide professional development and ultimately empower our teachers to unpack standards to develop lessons and tasks that utilize a variety of cognitive learning strategies to reach all students where they are and provide them with an instructional path to display mastery of the identified standard or an appropriate grade level component in daily lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

When a school functions as a true professional learning community, educators within that school embrace high levels of learning for ALL students as both the REASON the organization exists, as well as the fundamental responsibility of all who work within it. (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many & Mattos, Learning by Doing, 2016) In addition, data pulled from the 20-21 school year Standards Walk dashboard demonstrated a school-wide strength of using aligned materials and implementing aligned instruction. This data indicates a need to focus on student application.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize a Reading and Math Coach to provide job-embedded professional development related to standards and monitoring of levels of understanding through available data points at consistent intervals (i.e. benchmark testing and progress monitoring)

Person Responsible

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Utilize a Reading and Math Coach to help monitor the instructional practices and implementation of identified strategies and best practices that are aligned to standards based instruction to support learning and understanding, providing coaching, as needed.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Continue the scheduled blocks of weekly administratively directed common planning's to facilitate discussions, analyze student data points, and review student work in support of standards work and daily lesson alignment.

Person Responsible Julie Ehrenberg (guernonj@duvalschools.org)

Conduct at least 4 standards walks weekly as a leadership team, reviewing results and discussing next steps specifically related to Q28, Q21, & Q23 on the form.

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Calibrate using the standards walk through tool with the newly formed leadership team during the first four weeks of the 20-21 school year, reviewing ratings and artifacts.

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As updated test data has not been reported, we continue to utilize statewide accountability data as measured by the Florida State Assessment (FSA) for the 18-19 school year indicates that our subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) fall below the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index with a score of 32%. This is the only subgroup that falls below the identified threshold, and therefore is a targeted area of focus for the 21-22.
Measurable Outcome:	Our subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) will score about the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index on the 2021-2022 state accountability report as indicated by Florida State Assessment (FSA) data.
Monitoring:	The admin team will review current data and conduct data chats with teachers to monitor students growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All classrooms in all content areas will implement targeted, aligned interventions with students at their current instructional level and consistently monitored for effectiveness and adjusted according to the individual needs of each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Interventions that are aligned with grade level standards and scaffolded to support individual student instructional needs will connect and build upon learning to move a student down a prescribed instructional path that will lead to mastery of the identified standard. Federal Index data indicates the need for this intended focus to support our students with disabilities, but also supports the learning of all students across our campus.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement Reading Mastery intervention groups in primary grades.

Person Responsible Julie Ehrenberg (guernonj@duvalschools.org)

Implement Acaletics groupings aligned with on-going assessments to provide support specific to the student's current instructional level.

Person Responsible Keith Johnson (johnsonk4@duvalschools.org)

Provide job-embedded professional development, as needed, for specific research-based intervention programs such as Acaletics, Reading Mastery and LLI to support individual student needs.

Person Responsible Julie Ehrenberg (guernonj@duvalschools.org)

Utilize field experiences such as Starbase to provide hands-on, real-life opportunities for students outside the regular classroom setting that they may otherwise be unable to experience.

Person Responsible Julie Ehrenberg (guernonj@duvalschools.org)

Utilize weekly PLCs to analyze student work and data related to interventions and instructions to determine instructional next steps.

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@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 45%, 4th grade is 61%, and 5th grade is 57%.

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:

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

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.

Evidence-based Strategy:

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 Jennifer Gray (grayj1@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 Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@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.

Involved Families (5Essentials Component - Overall Score of 'Neutral')

Parent Involvement in School: mscore of 48, neutral, is a decrease of 11 points from the 19-20 year results.

Teacher Parent Trust is the lowest scored area, and as we begin to allow volunteers back into the building will be critical in building these relationships back up after more than a year without volunteers.

As a Title I School with an incredible Parent Resource Room, providing a focus on building capacity with our families to support their students at home is an integral part of our success. Therefore, this has been identified as out additional improvement priority for the 2021-2022 school year.

- 1. We will purchase and utilize a school-wide BLOOMZ platform to provide weekly classroom updates, as well as school-wide communications to increase the methods of communication and opportunities for us to engage with our families/school community.**
- 2. Our front office staff will continue to inform parents about our parent resource room, and we will advertise the room during all events. We will continue to grow this resource based upon suggestions and needs shared from our families during workshops and meetings.**
- 3. As we build on this partnership, we will utilize a Parent Liaison to make those parent connections, provide support in our Parent Resource Center, and assist with bridging the communication between our families, staff, and school community as a whole.**
- 4. We will provide parents with an overview of the room during Orientation and Open House. As a part of these events, we will highlight our parent resource room, BLOOMS partnership, and provide a quick spotlight on specific resources available in our resource room. This will be completed at each monthly event.**
- 5. Our staff will be trained on the resource room during pre-planning and will be asked to include specific suggestions related to this resource at parent conferences and when applicable in parent communications. We will assist staff with identifying specific resources that can support home instruction related to their current instructional focus.**
- 6. When needed, we will purchase additional supplies to support this connection and development of this instructional focus, providing additional copies of materials, electronic thumb drives with a variety of resources, and ultimately create take-home packets and binders of collected/copied/printed materials and resources for our families to support work at home.**
- 7. We will add a segment in our parent newsletter that provides a focus and highlight of a particular resource, while also providing a short summary of the many resources available for our families.**

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.

It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, and responsibility. We will do this by providing opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through monthly events such as our Parent-Student Conference Nights, Math and Literacy Nights, and Night of the Arts.

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

These events will also involve other stakeholders such as business partners, as well as our faith-based partners.

Part V: Budget

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

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