

Duval County Public Schools

R L Brown Gifted And Talented Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	29

R L Brown Gifted And Talented Academy

1535 MILNOR ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristi Kincaid

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

R L Brown Gifted And Talented Academy

1535 MILNOR ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

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

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 KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty and staff of Richard Lewis Brown Gifted and Academically Talented Academy will empower students to be successful in a global world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Richard Lewis Brown Gifted and Academically Talented Academy, we are a community of diverse learners committed to engaging the whole child in rigorous instruction that challenges them to think critically, take risks and reflect on their learning.

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
Kincaid, Kristi	Principal	Parent Conferences ELA-Collaborative Planning & Support School Improvement ELA Collaborative Planning & Support CAST Evaluations – Cat I School Culture- Vision/Mission Instructional Leader Opening/Closing of School Procedures PTSA Liaison Volunteer Liaison Faculty Meetings Comm. Ed/Extended Day Oversight School Budget Common Planning/ PD Oversight Quarterly Data Analysis Leadership Meetings Custodial Staff School Website/Social Media Facilities Supervision Payroll Oversight Master Calendar
Brandon, Toby	Assistant Principal	Parent Conferences Math- Collaborative Planning & Support School Improvement Instructional Leader Lunch Duty Schoolwide Discipline/Foundations K-5 School Improvement Plan Title I Compliance SAC Liaison CAST Evaluations – Cat II Cafeteria Staff Morning supervision (Hallways) Afternoon supervision (Bus Area) School Safety Plan/Fire Drills/Safety Drills Substitute Coverage Back to School Orientations Master Schedule Good News Ambassador Leadership Meetings (absence of Principal) Test Chair Testing Administration Testing PD Trainings Exam Schedules Assessment Data
Nelson, Josh	School Counselor	MRT Meetings MTSS

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Whole/Small group lessons Crisis Management Tiered Behavior Support for teachers RtI Implementation SDMT Chair PBIS Chair 504 meeting/oversight ESE Oversight ELL oversight Quarterly Academic Progress Monitoring Student Records/Cum Folders 1st Day Student Packets Progress Monitoring Plans Magnet Recruitment Homeless Liaison
Mobley, Deshandra	Other	Common Planning Support Instructional Materials Inventory - Math BQ Monitoring & Interventions School Wide Data Analysis – Math Monitor i-ready usage Weekly Blended Learning Reports Math/STEM Night School-wide Math Goal Instructional Leadership Team
Pires, Janice		Common Planning Support Instructional Materials Inventory – ELA BQ Monitoring & Interventions School Wide Data Analysis – ELA Monitor i-ready usage Monitor Achieve Usage Weekly Blended Learning Reports School-wide Writing Implementation 3rd Reading Portfolios Literacy Night Plan Reading Goal Plan Instructional Leadership Team
Aponte, Carolyn	Teacher, ESE	Common Planning Support ESE Services & Interventions School Wide Data Analysis Monitor i-ready usage Monitor Achieve Usage Weekly Blended Learning Reports Reading Goal Plan Instructional Leadership Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Kristi Kincaid

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

0

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

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school

272

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

4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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

Monday 7/26/2021

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	36	37	53	75	45	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	317	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	10	20	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	3	1	3	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	12	23	29	46	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	16	27	35	55	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	

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	13	23	29	46	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	36	37	53	75	45	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	317
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	10	20	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	3	1	3	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	12	23	29	46	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	16	27	35	55	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	13	23	29	46	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				48%	50%	57%	42%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	44%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				50%	62%	63%	43%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	63%	62%	39%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	52%	51%	33%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				33%	48%	53%	40%	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	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	49%	-16%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For grades K-2, i-ready data was reviewed by grade level and content area

For grades 3-5, Progress Monitoring (PMA) Data was used for ELA, Math and Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	44%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	38%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	29%	43%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	38%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	44%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	29%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	25%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	19%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	24%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	25%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	50%	50%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44%	50%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	38%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	28%	28%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44%	48%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	37%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	21%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	29%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	27%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	25%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	18%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	9%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	20%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	15%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	10%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	20%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	15%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	10%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23%	20%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	12%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	10%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	11	8		11	25		10				
BLK	32	20	20	32	34	45	21				
WHT	64			55							
FRL	27	22	20	29	34	45	19				
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	22	44	36	23	40	38					
BLK	41	47	42	44	46	41	29				
WHT	82	71		73	71						
FRL	38	49	42	39	46	41	27				

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	21	33		14	33	33					
BLK	37	44	55	40	35	26	35				
WHT	81			62							
FRL	36	42	52	36	35	30	29				

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	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	211
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

Asian Students	
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	29
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	60
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	28
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?

The lowest performance was in our science proficiency on the 5th grade NGSSS Statewide Assessment. The factors that contributed to the decrease from 33% in 2019 to 24% in 2021 were the rotation schedule not allowing enough time to properly teach the science standards, a first year science teacher who struggled with the content, and a lack of consistent hands-on experiments/labs; more focus needed on standards based aligned tasks and assessments.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was our ELA lowest 25th percentile which declined from 52% in 2018 to 42% in 2019, a 10 percentage point decrease. The factors that contributed to this decline were teachers not providing appropriate Tier 2 or Tier 3 support to the BQ, limited center rotations for differentiation, mostly whole group instruction taking place, teachers struggled to interpret content standards, progress monitoring data and make instructional decisions about next steps.

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

The greatest gap between school performance and state performance in 2019 was in science proficiency which had a 20% difference. The factors that contributed to this gap were the rotation schedule not allowing enough time to properly teach the science standards, a first year science teacher who struggled with the content, and a lack of consistent hands-on experiments/labs.

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

The most improvement in 2019 was in math learning gains which moved from 39% in 2018 to 49% in 2019, a 10 percentage point increase. The actions we took in this area included a math coach who was very experienced with standards-based instruction who pulled students frequently to provide the Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions needed to show student gains. The coach also provided instructional support for content teachers and built very strong relationships with her group of students further promoting an ownership of learning.

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

The single most factor for improvement was consistent, effective small group instruction that scaffolded learning of students who were performing below grade level expectations.

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

In order to accelerate learning, there must be a focus on teacher-led small group instruction based on the needs of the students. Teachers will effectively implement GRR model to engage students in whole and small and group instruction. The design on the lesson will focus on aligned tasks/assessments that are supported through a standards-based focus.

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.

Common planning will take place bi-weekly for all teachers to include VE and interventionists. All teachers will collaborate on the results of student work, aligned tasks and blended learning. All teachers will engage in ongoing unpacking of standards, developing focus calendars and data chats.

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

Additional support will be implemented in the form of pull out interventions through the use of a math and reading interventionist. These interventionists will provide tier III intensive remediation to our most vulnerable population of students. Our standards coach will support teachers with push in tier II instruction and pull out tier III. The standards coach will also support teachers with planning and standards based resources for teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Less than half of the classrooms show standards based aligned instruction when looking at tasks, delivery and assessments. Based on the 5 Essentials survey, collaborative practices was measured at 1%. Based on this, the primary focus will be to ensure the alignment of instructional standards with delivery of instruction to accelerate learning and provide opportunities for high achievement.

Measurable Outcome: 100% of content teachers will engage in common planning that addresses successful standards-based instruction planning, alignment and implementation.

Monitoring: Ongoing monitoring will occur during weekly calibrations (to include teachers) of standards-based walkthroughs. Data from the weekly walkthroughs will be shared with teachers to identify next steps in the areas focus board, instructional delivery and assessments. Teachers will participate in bi-weekly data chats where student work and aligned tasks will be discussed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize Learning Arcs to engage core teachers in the planning process to unpack standards, address instructional delivery and align student tasks and assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: There is inconsistent implementation of effective standards-based instructional practices, aligned curriculum and assessments throughout the school. When all teachers collaborate, engage in focused professional development, and receive consistent feedback from school leadership, it will help to raise the achievement level of our students in the core subject areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will regularly participate in common planning sessions and Grade-Level Professional Learning Communities with administration and interventionists to collaborate on developing learning arcs that address standards-based alignment relating to effective instructional practices, analyzing student work and data collection/assessments.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

School Leadership will conduct frequent calibration walkthroughs in the core subjects utilizing the Standards Walkthrough Protocol to observe and provide feedback to teachers as it relates to the alignment of instructional delivery, materials used, student tasks/activities, and student assessment in the core subjects to the Florida standards.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Implement core curriculum and Reading Mastery (K-2nd Grade) Corrective Reading (3rd -5th Grade) with fidelity to meet the needs of all students. The effectiveness of instruction will be measured through walkthroughs and lesson checks.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Implement core curriculum and Acaletics intervention (2nd -5th Grade) with fidelity to meet needs of all students. The effectiveness of instruction will be measured through walkthroughs and intervention assessments.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Science Acaletics and Study Island will be implemented in 5th grade to review all standards that will be assessed on the state assessment. School Leadership will collaborate with Science Teachers to implement focus calendars and assessments to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Consistent monitoring of teacher's daily schedule for consistency of pacing and planning effectiveness.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Common Planning sessions will yield Learning arcs portfolio of standards based instruction evidenced by student work/assessment.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate teacher learning during professional development on formative assessments and vertical alignment across grade levels.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Consistent implementation of a school-wide positive behavior support system to ensure a safe, supportive and responsive learning environment for all stakeholders, especially our students.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is for office managed discipline referrals to decrease by 20% to 120 total referrals (150 total in 19-20) and our restorative justice (RJ) practices to increase by 138% to 50 (21 total in 19-20).
Monitoring:	Ongoing monitoring and data analysis of incident referrals, counselor referrals, positive behavior referrals. Teachers will participate in bi-weekly data chats for PBIS to monitor common areas and schoolwide expectations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will provide on-going training for all school personnel and progress monitor behavior data to successfully implement an effective school-wide PBIS system to include fully implementing Calm Classroom curriculum which supports the social-emotional growth of our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on our 2019-20 5Essentials survey, there was a 21 point decrease in students feeling safe at RLB. One of our primary goals is to focus on building a stronger PBIS system to support our students' social and emotional growth that will, in turn, lower our number of total referrals, promote increased engagement in learning and foster a supportive learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

School Leadership and PBIS Members will model and monitor school-wide expectations for all stakeholders to ensure the appropriate implementation of rituals and routines, positive behavior plans, social-emotional curriculum, and school wide PBIS initiatives.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Teachers/staff will receive ongoing feedback from weekly walkthroughs focusing on behavioral expectations, student engagement, and the classroom learning environment to celebrate successes and support areas of need.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

School Leadership and the PBIS Team will continually monitor school-wide discipline data to problem-solve areas of concern, provide feedback to staff and determine training needs to teachers and students.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Daily implementation of Calm Classroom curriculum in all K-5 classes to target self-awareness, focus and emotional resilience.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Utilize school-wide incentive program to include school wide Bear Bucks behavior system, positive referrals and student of the month awards to celebrate students.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Proactively identify students who are struggling behaviorally and implement appropriate interventions to include mentoring, small group counseling, restorative justice and full service supports.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Ongoing student feedback through the use of surveys/checkpoints, assemblies and small group forums to determine next steps to ensure a safe and responsive environment.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the level of gains/proficiency in of our lowest performing 3rd through 5th grade students in reading, math and science.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is for 55% of our 3rd-5th grade students to be proficient in reading, 55% proficient in math, 50% proficient in science, 60% make reading and math gains, and 60% of our lowest performing students making gains in reading and math.
Monitoring:	Ongoing monitoring will occur during weekly data analysis of blended learning reports in the content areas. Teachers will participate in bi-weekly data chats where student work and aligned tasks will be discussed for the targeted subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math interventionist and reading teacher to pull small groups of lower performing students to facilitate remedial instruction of standards, monitor and assess reading and math achievement progress, and provide tiered support to teachers through modelling lessons, providing resources, and facilitating collaborative planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our math interventionist and reading teacher will be leveraged to support our lowest performing students in 3rd through 5th grade with Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction that will lead to a higher percentage making required gains in math, science and reading.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in common planning and professional development sessions to collaborate with peers in developing learning arcs, disaggregating formative assessment data, identifying intervention resources/programs, and developing activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' s instructional strengths.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Implement Freckle, iready and Achieve blended learning platform for 3rd- 5th grade reading math students; progress monitor data to make adjustments to drive small group instruction.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Utilize academic tutor to provide extra face-to-face support for our 3rd-5th grade lowest performing students facilitating tiered standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Implement research-based intervention curriculum such as Acaletics and Corrective Reading to help close the learning gap of our lowest-performing students in math, science and reading.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Regular data chats with teachers to drill down grade-level standards using PMA data, standards-based assessments and focus calendars to determine alignment based on student performance.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

Implement after school tutoring for students in grades 2-5 to increase face-to-face instructional time in small groups to address learning gaps.

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@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 47%, 4th grade is 71%, and 5th grade is 79%.

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:

Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@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 Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@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 Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@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.

- 1. Reading and math Interventionist will provide push in and pull out support for targeted students, which includes all subgroups. Tier III instruction will be designed to increase proficiency and growth in reading and math.**
- 2. School Supplies will be utilized to create and post visual cues/ anchor charts for students in classrooms to create common language for greater understanding of standards aligned instruction, Florida Standards/BEST, and embedded language within the standards to increase proficiency across all areas. Printer toner will be used to create common board configurations, data charts and goals sheets to display standards in all K-5 classrooms. All students will have 1-to-1 access to laptops, additional headphones will be used in the classroom for blended learning and testing purposes. The use of projectors and document cameras will increase student engagement through student/teacher modeling, videos and PPTs outlined in the standards-based curriculum.**
- 3. Full and part-time Paraprofessionals will support classroom teachers in small group instruction and assist in the STEM lab for 4th and 5th grade students as they conduct aligned missions.**
- 4. Standards coach will improve instructional delivery with teachers through the tiered coaching model based on consistent walkthroughs of standards-based instruction. Data from walkthroughs will be used to determine next steps for common planning.**

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 our goal to ensure parents are involved in the school improvement process. We will continue to seek input from our stakeholders on activities they recommend and incorporate their feedback into our school-wide planning. Student data is reviewed to assist families to find areas of weakness to support their child and create training to strengthen the school and parent relationship. Our training will be scheduled to address the needs of parents and students whether its academic or social.

The school invites all stakeholders to work together via parent nights, SAC, PTA, and training. The school

uses various forms of communication such as Parent compacts, conferences, Class Dojo, FOCUS, school website, and flyers to engage all families.

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

- Principal - School Leader for culture
- Assistant Principal - PBIS co-chair
- School Counselor - PBIS co-chair
- Grade Level Teachers - PBIS team

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00