

Duval County Public Schools

Garden City 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	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Garden City Elementary School

2814 DUNN AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

Demographics

Principal: Ashley M IR O

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Garden City Elementary School

2814 DUNN AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

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	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	87%

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 mission of Garden City Elementary school is to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for the success of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Garden City Elementary school is to provide a caring and stimulating environment where children will recognize and achieve their full potential.

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
Cannington, Ashley	Principal	The principal will provide opportunities for teachers collaboration, communicate and reinforce expectation for data based decision making, conduct walk-throughs to monitor fidelity and integrity of core curriculum and intervention implementation; monitor teacher effectiveness; communicates with all shareholders information regarding school data and student achievement progress, implements and monitors behavior intervention. provides opportunities for teacher professional development in effective teaching strategies and best practices. Ms. Cannington will serve as the instructional leader and practice shared decision making based on the needs on the school. The principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community member with securing business partners.
Jones, Georgette	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will provide instructional support and coordinate professional development/ coaching support for instructors; Coordinate and manage school wide assessments, conduct walkthroughs to monitor implementation of SIP strategies, implements and monitor behavior intervention, monitor student achievement through analyzing school-wide data, assist with the development of intervention and differentiated instruction. In addition , Mrs. Jones will serve as a support for understanding and aligning standards to instructional practice. The assistant principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community member with securing business partners.
	School Counselor	The school counselor will schedule and attend IEP, EP, RTI meeting and maintain documentation of all students involved in the MRT process. This includes sending parents invites, complete and necessary forms. The school counselor will conduct small group and individual counseling sessions, conduct classroom lesson

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/30/2021, Ashley M IR O

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

346

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

5

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

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	48	47	57	50	63	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	328
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	22	19	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	1	3	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	4	3	5	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	11	30	35	32	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	12	31	33	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	27	32	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	4	3	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/30/2021

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	71	79	82	84	67	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	4	5	2	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	71	79	82	84	67	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	4	5	2	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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				42%	50%	57%	39%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	62%	63%	64%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	63%	62%	60%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	52%	51%	50%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				31%	48%	53%	55%	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	47%	51%	-4%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	50%	-14%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	64%	10%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

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.

Forthcoming

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

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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

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	17			53							
BLK	38	43	69	62	53	91	17				
HSP				30							
WHT	48			67							
FRL	36	45		56	53	90	17				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	26	20	44	53	36					
BLK	41	51	38	61	64	44	30				
HSP	27	45		40	55						
WHT	44			69							
FRL	38	47	41	57	60	39	22				

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	13	45		35	45						
BLK	38	50	52	65	62	57	55				
HSP	33	50		40	33						
WHT	50	46		71	54						
FRL	40	49	50	63	57	50	55				

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	54
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	53
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	58
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

LPQ Students Specifically, Students with disabilities continuously performs under the 41% Federal index for reading.

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

Reading proficiency across all grade levels

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

Standard based teaching and learning and ongoing progress monitoring

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

Based on 2019 FSA data, Reading proficiency increased from 39% to 42%, resulting in a 3% increase.

In addition to Math LPQ increased from 60% to 65%, resulting in a 5% increase.

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

Differentiated instruction
Data-based instruction
Standard-based instruction

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

Scaffolding intentionally
Building Knowledge and Vocabulary
Prioritizing Standards
Intentionally Guided Reading
Diagnosing Essential Missed Learning (WHY)
Incorporating Text Sets

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.

Strong Adherence to professional development
calibration of student work
Intensive data review
communicate learning priority
progress monitoring
Instructional Rounds/Learning Walks
Learning Arc Framework

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

Continue to base decisions on the needs of students
 Continually Review Needs of assessment
 Monitor goals and assessments
 Outline specific action steps
 involve all stakeholders in the process
 Communicate any barriers to learning
 Communicate successes and milestones

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is closing the achievement gap with our student population demonstrating performing below grade level expectations. Specifically we will work to see an increase with proficiency in 4th grade ELA going from 51% to 35%, proficiency in 5th grade ELA going from 36% to 28%, and proficiency in Science going from 33% to 19%. We noticed that upon a review of the Standards Walkthrough Dashboard data, the lowest category was assessing student learning. What we realized, based on conversations with teachers, is that work tasks and assessments opportunities intended to indicate mastery of the standards did not reflect the progression of learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Through intentional and rigorous standards based lesson planning specifically, utilizing the Learning Arc framework, we would move from weak/moderate to strong on the SBI platform. Through this intentional support our ultimate goal is to improve reading proficiency throughout our school by 8 points.
Monitoring:	Ensure all materials and instruction during tier 1 instruction is on grade level and aligned to the Florida Standards
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Cannington (canningtoa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Garden City Administration and Teachers will set quarterly learning targets for individual students, classroom, for grade levels as well as for the entire school. We will differentiate small group/ remediation based on standard based outcomes
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When using standard based materials and using standards to guide instruction, we are certain that students will master grade level content. Differentiation is essential to meet the specific needs of our students. It allows us to cater instruction and pinpoint learning priorities and create a plan of support. Reviewing learning target quarterly, monthly, and bi-weekly, helps keep a pulse of progress and adjust or modify our action plan. Use of media carts (to house computers in every classroom) and headphones to provide equitable computer use time for students to have differentiated instruction via district-adopted blended learning platforms Use of the reading coach to run coaching cycles with all ELA teachers in the building in order to identify and provide resources to support standards-based instruction in every classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Science Proficiency has decreased from 33% to 19% from 2019 to 2021, respectively. This area of focus is closing the achievement gap with our student population demonstrating performing below grade level expectations. Specifically we will work to see an increase with proficiency in Science. Through observation and conversation with teachers, it appears that most students in 5th grade last year were not engaging in learning through DHR and therefore missed application of knowledge through demonstrations and science experiments. Moreover, the tasks and assessments were not aligned to the complexity of the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

Through intentional and rigorous standards based lesson planning specifically, utilizing the Learning Arc framework, and providing Equivalence Experience Assessments, we will move from weak/moderate to strong on the SBW platform. Additionally, resources and staff in the building will be used to provide targeted, differentiated instruction for ELA to increase capacity. Since the correlation between ELA and Science is interwoven, it is essential to remediate students in both subjects. Through this intentional support, our ultimate goal is to improve science proficiency throughout our school by 9 points.

Monitoring:**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Garden City Administration and Teachers will set quarterly learning targets for individual students along with the LPQ for 5th Grade Science students.

We will differentiate small group/ remediation based on standard based outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

When using standard based materials and using standards to guide instruction, we are certain that students will master grade level content.

Differentiation is essential to meet the specific needs of our students. It allows us to cater instruction and pinpoint learning priorities and create a plan of support.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Reviewing learning target quarterly, monthly, and bi-weekly, helps keep a pulse of progress and adjust or modify our action plan.

Use of the reaching coach and paraprofessionals to develop schedules and provide differentiated instruction in ELA and science to students daily.

Use of the full time librarian to run intervention groups for science.

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:**

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 49%, 4th grade is 65%, and 5th grade is 72%.

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:

Ashley Cannington (canningtoa@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 Ashley Cannington (canningtoa@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 Ashley Cannington (canningtoa@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Ashley Cannington (canningtoa@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.

Building a positive culture starts with valuing everyone's service and commitment to education. The more we recognize the great work within our community, acknowledge the impact, and create intentional opportunities to share our stories, the better chance we have to provide an environment where everyone can flourish.

We will;
 Encourage risk-taking
 Model expected behaviors
 Support others
 Make time to grow together
 Actively listen
 Value input and suggestions

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

Our stakeholders play an important role in managing schools. They are partners of the school leaders in making our school conducive to teaching and learning. They are also responsible for the achievement of the learning outcomes through their active participation in school activities, programs, and projects.

At Garden City we believe, a positive culture is the soul of an establishment and should be treated as such. It is the essence or embodiment of all that is seen and unseen regarding the educational institution. It takes a great deal of time and energy to create and maintain a positive culture but it's essential for all successful schools.