

Duval County Public Schools

Rufus E. Payne Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rufus E. Payne Elementary School

6725 HEMA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

Demographics

Principal: Weisha Day Kilette

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2021

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 (51%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: C (49%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rufus E. Payne Elementary School

6725 HEMA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

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	98%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission at Rufus E. Payne is to establish and promote an environment that caters to the total needs of the child, our parents, and the community. This environment will stimulate and motivate learning through a positive behavior system that promotes student achievement and instills restorative justice. It is through these efforts that our students foster a strong desire to unearth their greatest potentials in life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is our vision as educators that we will provide a meaningful, comprehensive educational program. Through prescriptive and cooperative learning, hands on, and inquiry based instruction, the students of Rufus E. Payne Elementary will grow and ultimately come to discover the special talents they each possess to become global learners.

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
Day, Weisha	Principal	Weisha Day-Killette, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl, conducts assessment(quarterly status reports) of Rtl skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.
Warren, Carrie	Assistant Principal	Carrie Warren, Assistant Principal: Provides a shared vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team conducts an assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.
Rochay, Angela	Math Coach	Angela Rochay, Math Coach: Provides math instructional support to all teachers, as well as conducts PLCs based on both teacher and student need. Supports teachers by assisting with analyzation of data, model lessons, and coaching cycles.
Stadt, Natalie	School Counselor	Natalie Stadt, School Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; links community agencies to schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; includes group and individual student interventions, and conducts direct observation of student behavior.
Wright, Cynthia	Teacher, ESE	Cynthia Wright, Varying Exceptionalities (ESE) Teacher/Lead: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Guides teachers through the Rtl documentation process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/18/2021, Weisha Day Kilette

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Total number of students enrolled at the school

230

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

0

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	15	34	30	56	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	1	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	6	2	1	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	7	3	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	6	2	1	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	6	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	7	4	1	15	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/18/2021

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	37	40	35	48	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	258	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	33	34	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	3	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in ELA	4	8	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	5	11	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	

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	2	2	5	24	24	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	

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	37	40	35	48	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	258	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	33	34	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	3	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in ELA	4	8	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	5	11	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	

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	2	2	5	24	24	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				40%	50%	57%	34%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	56%	58%	38%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	50%	53%	50%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	62%	63%	42%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	63%	62%	42%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	52%	51%	33%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				24%	48%	53%	20%	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	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	52%	-5%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	50%	-17%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	23%	49%	-26%	53%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kindergarten - I-Ready Blended Learning Tool

First Grade - I-Ready Blended Learning Tool

Second Grade - I-Reading Learning Tool

Third Grade District Progress Monitoring Assessments

Fourth Grade - District Progress Monitoring Assessments

Fifth Grade - District Progress Monitoring Assessments

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/26%	6/21%	9/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/25%	5/19%	8/33%
	Students With Disabilities	2/50%	1/50%	1/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/18%	3/12%	8/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/16%	2/8%	7/33%
	Students With Disabilities	2/50%	1/50%	1/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/12%	5/13%	2/5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/11%	4/12%	1/3%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/7%	1/3%	7/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8%	1/3%	5/15%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/28%	19/51%	18/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/24%	16/48%	16/46%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/29%	1/13%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/52%	20/54%	21/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/48%	16/48%	18/60%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/14%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/22%	14/36%	12/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/21%	12/33%	10/29%
	Students With Disabilities	3/20%	5/42%	5/42%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/02%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/36%	14/35%	11/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/33%	13/35%	9/29%
	Students With Disabilities	5/38%	5/42%	4/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/36%	12/36%	9/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/37%	12/39%	8/28%
	Students With Disabilities	3/30%	3/30%	2/22%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/34%	10/30%	12/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/331%	10/32%	12/41%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11%	3/30%	3/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/19%	10/30%	16/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/21%	10/32%	16/55%
	Students With Disabilities	2/20%	3/30%	5/56%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

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	13	18		38	36		50				
BLK	18	30		42	45		37				
FRL	18	31		39	47		41				
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	19	40	55	42	50	50	8				
BLK	40	53	70	58	61	67	23				
FRL	41	49	68	57	58	57	21				
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	9	22		21	32	20					
BLK	35	38	48	43	44	35	21				
FRL	33	36	50	43	41	35	18				

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	36
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	180
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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 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	34
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
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 two K - 2 grade subgroups (FRL and SWD) showed an increase in their scores for each diagnostic for reading. However, with their math there was inconsistent student growth. More focused instruction that addresses the needs of the students was used to have consistent growth. With 4th and 5th grade, there is more inconsistency with student growth among the subgroups. Third grade was the only grade level with all three Math PMA that consistently show academic increase with each PMA diagnostic.

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

I-Ready Data components for K - 2nd grade, and the Progress Monitoring Assessment for 3rd - 5th grade shows the greatest need for improvements.

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 contributing factors would be to provide instruction to the students face to face, instead of virtual learning. Providing direct instruction to students that are "face to face" will allow the teacher a better chance to address students misconceptions.

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

The PMA 1, 2 and 3 for third grade and Kindergarten I-Ready Math, showed the most continuous student improvement over the course of the year.

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

The third grade math teacher looped up with her students since Kindergarten, therefore she was aware of their strengths and deficiencies and was able to address their needs more efficiently. The kindergarten teachers, created a learning environment in which the students were used as peer tutors with their classmates once a concept was introduced. Both teachers created independent, accountable learners.

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

1. Small groups/centers based
2. Teacher led small group, in which deficiencies can be addressed

3. Intensive small group meetings
4. Before & After-school tutoring

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.

1. Early Release Day Training will provide professional development to teachers based on the needs, from the data.
2. Weekly/Bi-Weekly PLC for Math and Reading
3. After-school Trainings
4. District Level Professional Development trainings.

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

The additional services that will be needed to ensure sustainability is the maintaining a Reading Coach, Reading Interventionist, Math Coach, Math Interventionist and Science Coach. Also, receiving an adequate amount of resource materials that can be utilized with the small groups that are being targeted.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Less than 40% of the classrooms at Rufus E. Payne show consistent standard-based instructional delivery and tasks that aligned to assessments. The alignment of teacher's standards-based instructional delivery practices, tasks, and assessments will be our area of focus based on the observational data.

Measurable Outcome: 70% of our core classrooms will successfully demonstrate aligning standards-based instructional practices, student tasks, and assessments.

Monitoring: Lesson alignment will ensure that students are exposed to instruction, tasks, and assessments that are aligned with the current grade-level standards. This will be measured using the administrative "Standards-Based Walkthrough Form".

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Weisha Day (dayw@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: As stated in the article "The Pros and Cons of Standards-based Education," published by the University of Wisconsin in July 2019: "Standards-based instruction guides planning and instruction and helps teachers keep their focus on the learning target. Teachers are aware of what materials were taught in previous years and what will be taught in years to come. They are free to concentrate on the limited number of skills and concepts included in their grade-level standards." Through standards-based instruction, we will be able to create a program of cohesiveness for students so that they are able to concentrate and master their appropriate grade-level work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using data obtained from classroom observations, ranging from standards-based focus boards to delivery of the lesson; by utilizing the standard-based focus board it will help teachers to stay focus on the specific learning targets that are aligned with the standard being addressed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development for content area teachers with a focus on how to utilize(ALD's) Achievement Level Descriptors and Item specifications to ensure that student tasks/assessments are aligned to the FSA with grade-level rigor.
2. Administration conduct observation of instruction through the use of the SWT tool and dashboard.
3. Leadership Team will provide support to content area teachers as needed
4. Administration and Leadership Team will monitor evidence of instructional delivery and alignment of tasks/assessments to the standard.

Person Responsible: Weisha Day (dayw@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Less than 50% of the classrooms in Rufus E. Payne implement CHAMPS to effectively maintain structure and discipline.

Measurable Outcome:

CHAMPS ensures that students are exposed to a practical and positive approach to classroom management. The objective is to have more than 50% of teachers utilizing CHAMPS within their classroom and a reduction in discipline referrals by 10% from using CHAMPS.

Monitoring:

As stated in the " CHAMPS- A Proactive & Positive Approach to Classroom Management." by Randy Sprick, Ph.D. Effective instructional practices are an absolutely integral part of behavior management practices (Gettinger & Ball, 2008; Scheuermann & Hall, 2008). A teacher who implements dull instruction presents unclear tasks or assigns work that is consistently beyond the ability of some of the students is likely to have some students who appear unmotivated, disruptive, or hostile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carrie Warren (warrenc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

CHAMPS ensures that students are exposed to a practical and positive approach to classroom management. Teachers will be afforded the opportunity to use the "Tough Kid Toolbox" in conjunction with CHAMPS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

As stated in the " CHAMPS- A Proactive & Positive Approach to Classroom Management." by Rand Sprick, Ph.D. Effective instructional practices are an absolutely integral part of behavior management practices (Gettinger & Ball, 2008; Scheuermann & Hall, 2008). A teacher who implements dull instruction presents unclear tasks or assigns work that is consistently beyond the ability of some of the students is likely to have some students who appear unmotivated, disruptive, or hostile.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading will increase proficiency by 10% specifically targeting our bubble students. The targeted students are those who were 10% below Level 3 proficiency rate and 10% above Level 2 on the Florida State Assessment. We will also focus on student growth with all students with an emphasis on our Bottom Quartile students.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase reading by 10% overall in proficiency and increase student growth by 11%. Reading strategies will be integrated across all curriculum.
Monitoring:	To increase the student reading proficiency by 10%, we will monitor the delivery of lesson, student work samples, and all assessments given. After monitoring, a plan of action will be created and implemented by the teacher and reading team. Weekly and/or bi-weekly analysis of the outcome will be discussed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carrie Warren (warrenc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	An evidence-based strategy that will be utilized will be a standards-based focus board as a teaching and learning tool for the students. Following up with the standards-based focus board will be standards-based lessons that will provide detailed instructions as the standards are unpacked and implemented through the Gradual Release Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy aligns with the FL State Standards. Using research-based resources, such as Ready FL LAFS (3 - 5) and Benchmark Advanced 2 for K-2, will aid in the standards-based instruction. Also, the alignment of assessments, activities, materials and instructional processes to standards is the foundation of the student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards-Based Focus Board visibly located on the front board.
2. Standards-Based Lesson Plans with specific areas of focus (opening, work period, accountable talk, and guided practice).
3. Using the Ready Florida LAFS for grades 3 - 5 and Benchmark Advanced 2 for grades K-2.
4. Bi-weekly assessing and monitoring of students' progress.
5. Students will take a Research Inquiry-Based Field Trip to the Animal Kingdom, Sea World, Wild Florida and Lego Land.
6. The Reading Coach will work with teachers to expand their knowledge of Standards-Based Instruction.
7. Tutors
8. Purchase additional supplies that are needed to support student learning and increase academic proficiency.

Person Responsible Carrie Warren (warrenc@duvalschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase all student growth within Math by 10% with an intense focus on the Students With Disabilities SWD population because this makes up half of our bottom quartile students. As a trend, when the students are identified as ESE and BQ these students have difficulty showing growth
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the proficiency and growth by 10% with our overall student population. Focusing on the ESE and BQ students should give us a foundation for increasing proficiency and growth
Monitoring:	To increase the student math proficiency by 10%, we will monitor the delivery of lessons, student work samples, and all assessments given. After monitoring, a plan of action will be created and implemented by the teacher and reading team. Weekly and/or bi-weekly analyses of the outcome will be discussed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Rochay (rochaya@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	An evidence-based strategy that will be utilized will be a standards-based focus board as a teaching and learning tool for the students. Following up with the standards-based focus board will be standards-based lessons that will provide detailed instructions as the standards are unpacked and implemented through the Gradual Release Model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy aligns with the FL State Standards. Using research-based resources, such as Ready FL MAFS (K - 5) will aid in the standards-based instruction. Also, the alignment of assessments, activities, materials and instructional processes to standards is the foundation of the student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards-Based Focus Board visibly located on the front board.
2. Standards-Based Lesson Plans with specific areas of focus (opening, work period, accountable talk, and guided practice).
3. Using the Ready Florida MAFS for grades K - 5.
4. Bi-weekly assessing and monitoring of students' progress.
5. Math Interventionist
6. Math Coach

Person Responsible Weisha Day (dayw@duvalschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase all student growth in Science by 10% with an intense focus on the SWD population because this makes up half of our bottom quartile students. As a trend, when the students are identified as SWD and BQ these students have difficulty showing proficiency in Science.
Measurable Outcome:	The state average for proficiency in Science is 53% and our Science proficiency average is 24%, with a difference of 29%. Our goal is to increase our Science proficiency from 29% to 35% by using Science Acaletics, Study Island, and exposure to science vocabulary.
Monitoring:	The Science Coach will meet weekly with teachers to discuss the implementation with grades K-5, with an emphasis on instruction, implementation, labs and assessing students progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Rochay (rochaya@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	An evidence-based strategy that will be used to increase science proficiency will be implementing the Science Acaletics program and conducting Quick Checks throughout the program. Along with Science Acaletics, the use of Study Island will be included as a strategy to use with the students to increase their knowledge base and proficiency with science. These strategies will be funneled through precise lesson plans that are aligned with the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that students exposed to science vocabulary consistently will be able to understand more of the science text that they will encounter. By continuous use of Science Acaletics, Study Island and focus standards-based lessons, our students should show an increase in their proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards-based focus lessons.
2. Implementation of standards-based focus lessons with a science teacher and the utilization of the science lab.
3. Use of Science Acaletics and Study Island with fidelity
4. Bi-weekly monitoring of students progress
5. Science Coach will work with Tier II and III students
6. Tutors

Person Responsible Angela Rochay (rochaya@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.

N/A

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.

During the 2021-2022 school year, Rufus Payne will ensure that all parents can participate by offering activities at various times and days. For example, we might have one event in the morning at the beginning of the week, and then do the next event in the evening at the end of the week. We will make sure events are advertised using a variety of communication methods (flyers, marquee, phone blast, school website). We will also ensure this communication is advertised at least 2 weeks prior to the event so that working parents can request time off if needed. As part of our advertising, we will ensure that parents know bus passes are available upon request. If translators are needed, we will be sure to contact the ESOL office for translators.

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

The stakeholders will be the PTA and SAC members, the community members, business partners and faith-based partners along with the faculty and staff members at the school. Monthly celebrations will be held along with quarterly celebrations to recognize the hard work of the parents, teachers and students.