

Duval County Public Schools

Bartram Springs Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bartram Springs Elementary

14799 BARTRAM SPRINGS PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

Demographics

Principal: Kimberley Wright

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bartram Springs Elementary

14799 BARTRAM SPRINGS PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	24%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

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

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.

Bartram Springs Eagles, families, and community working together will SOAR to attain educational excellence by:
providing a Safe, Inclusive, and Nurturing Environment,
providing Opportunities for academic, social, and emotional growth,
providing Academic success through focused, data driven instruction and
by continuously Reviewing student progress, to match instruction to meet the needs of an ever evolving community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage students in data-driven instruction that inspires them to take ownership of learning and excel academically while promoting leadership and collaboration that supports and encourages life-long 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
Wright, Kimberley	Principal	Oversee the School Leadership Team. The principal will share student data and lead the team in data analysis as well as problem solving. The team will work together to develop goals and strategies to improve student achievement. The team consists of representation from each grade level.
Bartley, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	
Dortch, Tatiana	Teacher, K-12	
Walsh, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	
Weeks, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	
Virgil, Jaclyn	Teacher, ESE	
Ray, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	
Pitts, Ingrid	Instructional Coach	
Clements, Vicki	Teacher, K-12	
Spears, Racheal	Teacher, K-12	
Hope, Katie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Kimberley Wright

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

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

6

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	234	188	198	167	159	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1078
Attendance below 90 percent	67	63	54	48	55	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	12	34	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	2	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	1	12	34	18	15	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	17	31	21	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

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	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/23/2021

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	204	196	175	149	157	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1023
Attendance below 90 percent	16	16	11	9	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	35	71	43	35	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	66	101	61	55	11	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323

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	30	66	36	29	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186

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	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	204	196	175	149	157	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1023
Attendance below 90 percent	16	16	11	9	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	35	71	43	35	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	66	101	61	55	11	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323

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	30	66	36	29	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186

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	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				78%	50%	57%	77%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				73%	56%	58%	67%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	50%	53%	51%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				81%	62%	63%	85%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	63%	62%	74%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	52%	51%	66%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				75%	48%	53%	79%	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	76%	51%	25%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	50%	23%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	70%	64%	6%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	57%	26%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

District PMAs in Reading and Math for 3rd, 4th and 5th grades

Science PMAs for 5th grade

iReady Reading and Math Diagnostics for 1st and 2nd grades

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	66%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	46%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	47%	69%
	English Language Learners	11%	44%	67%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	49%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	47%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	31%	56%
	English Language Learners	11%	22%	67%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47%	67%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	59%	85%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	24%	63%
	English Language Learners	8%	27%	70%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23%	52%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	36%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	35%	69%
	English Language Learners	8%	27%	70%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60%	66%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	41%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	28%	27%	35%
	English Language Learners	13%	17%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75%	76%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68%	67%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	41%	48%
	English Language Learners	25%	50%	0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68%	74%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	54%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	45%	67%	73%
	English Language Learners	100%	75%	60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	73%	65%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	40%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	45%	44%	53%
	English Language Learners	75%	50%	67%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63%	70%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	57%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	48%	43%
	English Language Learners	13%	13%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71%	73%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	63%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	41%	46%	43%
	English Language Learners	14%	25%	20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	75%	77%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	72%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	26%	39%	32%
	English Language Learners	14%	33%	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	44	28		48	40	17	33				
ELL	53			71							
ASN	77			83			73				
BLK	58	53	31	53	50	18	46				
HSP	63	47		70	53		57				
MUL	67			73							
WHT	80	77	73	81	63	50	79				
FRL	61	62	50	63	44	25	43				
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	60	66	56	62	63	52	45				
ELL	71	71		75	61						
ASN	86	79		93	72		88				
BLK	68	61	37	71	67	50	45				
HSP	81	72		87	69		73				
MUL	76	70		79	81		73				
WHT	80	78	70	83	75	59	85				
FRL	71	70	48	78	76	56	73				
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	48	47	24	57	57	44	45				
ELL	64	75	70	77	75						
ASN	87	80		91	83		88				
BLK	65	56	38	72	58	38	59				
HSP	82	81		87	70		95				
MUL	80	67		83	71						
WHT	78	66	47	87	80	80	81				
FRL	72	68	57	81	73	60	74				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
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?

One trend that emerges across all grade levels and subgroups is less than satisfactory achievement for the following subgroups: Students with Disabilities, African American students, ELL students and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Our lowest quartile students are struggling to make learning gains in both Reading and Math.

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

Even though we have seen some improvement in grades 3 - 5 in Reading, Math is definitely an area that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Learning gains (provide the data)
Proficiency (provide the data)

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

Based on our previous data, Reading showed the most improvement.

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

Using student data to provide intensive small group instruction.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will have an increased focus on supporting our 3rd grade students in ELA. Identified students will be tested in the fall. Students who are lacking basic foundation skills will receive support from a Reading Interventionist. These students will receive instruction from the Corrective Reading program.

Using the results from the 2020-21 FSA results, students will also be identified for additional support provided through before and after school tutoring. All teachers will provide support to students through small group instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development will include Thinking Maps, BEST standards for K - 2 teachers, Achieve 3000, Freckle, Study Island, book studies and analyzing student data.

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

Corrective Reading for selected 3rd grade students
Reading Mastery
LLI
Guided Reading
Tutoring

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2021 FSA data, our students demonstrated a decrease in Reading and Math proficiency as well as learning gains. Our Reading proficiency rate decreased from 78% in 2019 to 71% in 2021. Our Math proficiency rate decreased from 81% in 2019 to 73% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers provide targeted, data-driven instruction along with the appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, we will increase proficiency in Reading from 71% to 73% and in Math from 73% to 75% as well as increasing learning gains for our lowest 25% from 48% to 58% in Reading and 30% to 51% in Math.
Monitoring:	Admin will review student data from the progress monitoring assessments throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will provide standards-based instruction using resources such as Ready LAFS, Corrective Reading, Achieve 3000, Duval Math, Freckle and Study Island.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with gaps in reading and math foundational skills are less likely to demonstrate one year's growth as measured on the Reading and Math FSA. These students need targeted intervention taught through small group instruction or one-on-one instruction to remediate their skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will analyze data from the 2020-21 Reading and Math FSA, along with 2021-22 baseline and progress monitoring assessments to identify students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.
2. Teachers will group students based on their instructional needs.
3. Teachers will remediate foundational skills through small group instruction before, during and after school.
4. Freckle by Renaissance Learning will be used in grades 3 - 5.
5. Study Island will be used in grades 3 - 5.
6. iReady will be used in grades K - 2.

Person Responsible Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the results from the 2020-21 5 Essentials Survey, we need to focus improving in the areas of Effective Leaders and Collaborative Teachers. On the survey, we were rated as Neutral in the area of Effective Leaders and we were rated as Weak in the area of Collaborative Teachers. Our goal for 2021-22 is to improve to Strong in both of these areas.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers are provided with opportunities to collaborate and conduct peer observations, we will see an increase in positive responses on the 5 Essentials survey in the areas of Effective Leaders and Collaborative Teachers. .

Monitoring: Admin will use PLCs and Early Dismissal Days to monitor and track teacher participation. Teachers will also be expected to include peer observations and PLC meetings in their Individual Professional Development Plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 5 Essentials Survey is an evidence-based survey used to measure the culture and climate of the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The identified areas have been a concern since the implementation of the 5 Essentials Survey.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Share strategies to improve teacher collaboration during pre-planning.
2. Share expectations for Individual Professional Development Plans.
3. Provide time during Early Dismissal Days for teacher collaboration.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

Based on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org data, our school ranks in the MODERATE category. Data is from the 2019-20 school year. The School Incident Ranking is based on the number of students per 100 students. We ranked High for violent incidents, a total of 6 which included incidents of physical attacks, battery and bullying. We ranked Very Low in the categories of property and drug/public order incidents with a total of zero incidents.

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.

Our school provides a positive school culture by implementing a coherent shared vision among all stakeholders. This vision allows for all stakeholders to feel that their concerns and opinions are being heard and that they are being treated fairly. The administrative team operates within the concept of an open-door policy, wherein faculty and staff are encouraged to share ideas and/or initiatives freely. Surveys such as the 5Essentials, provide feedback that helps the administration to target areas of need related to the climate and culture. The establishment of teams such as Leadership, Shared Decision Making and PBIS ensures the voice of school-based stakeholders is considered as it relates to instructional needs and/or practices, the daily routines, and school-wide behavior concerns.

The School Advisory Committee helps to ensure the voices of stakeholders outside of the school setting are heard. This committee consists of individuals from various backgrounds who play a vital role in decision-making conversations related to school improvement.

CHAMPS, a school-wide behavior plan is implemented in all classrooms, as well as common areas within our school. Generating school and classroom expectations, including having leadership that will follow through consistently with consequences, creates a sense of trust and support from all stakeholders. Being able to align our classroom discipline processes, procedures and consequences with the Student Code of Conduct allows for all stakeholders to be involved which has the greatest effect on positive school culture. Recognition is one way students feel valued. Focusing on a character trait each month provides students the ability to be recognized by their teacher in front of other students, staff, and parents. The power of praise promotes an awareness that changes student behaviors and allows for others to see how this character trait aligns with our school expectations.

In regards to discipline, the PBIS team will share discipline data with staff each quarter. The purpose of this is to look for patterns and trends so that we can provide the necessary support.

New this year, is the creation a Culturally Responsive Team. The purpose of this team is to bring awareness and share strategies with staff.

Building authentic relationships between staff and all stakeholders with a focus on supporting all students will directly impact our school's success.

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

PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports) Team
 Danay Pierre - Chairperson
 Katie Hope - AP, Team Member
 One grade level representative from each grade level team

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00