Don Brewer Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Don Brewer Elementary School

3385 HARTSFIELD RD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/donbrewer

Demographics

Principal: Amy Novak

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (60%)
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

Don Brewer Elementary School

3385 HARTSFIELD RD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/donbrewer

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 3-5	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

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.

To provide a safe learning environment where students are challenged daily to meet high academic expectations through standards-based instruction and to nurture in each student a life-long love of learning and a commitment to responsible citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Don Brewer Elementary School's vision is to be a collaborative learning community dedicated to engaging and empowering students to become responsible and productive life-long 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
Novak, Amy	Principal	Instructional Leadership, Campus Safety/Security, Staff Professional Development and Support, Facilities Management, Parent Outreach, Community Partnerships, Curriculum Planning and Development, Staff Evaluation and Assessment, Data Disaggregation, Visionary Planning
Royce, Erin	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership, Staff Development and Evaluation, Student Discipline, Test Coordinator
Poliseo, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student Mental Health, Guidance Lessons and Support, ESE Support, ELL/ESOL Support, Full School Cooridinator
Komatina, Michael	Reading Coach	ELA Curriculum/Instructional Support for Teachers
Caldwell, Charles	Math Coach	Math Curriculum/Instructional Support for Teachers

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/5/2021, Amy Novak

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.*
2

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

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

362

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

4

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	141	100	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	360
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	21	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	73	42	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	45	56	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171

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	1	2	6	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 9/13/2021

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	0	0	0	152	147	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	441
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	53	37	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	71	50	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	98	48	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184

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	82	45	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	0	0	0	152	147	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	441
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	53	37	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	71	50	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	98	48	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184

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	82	45	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	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				46%	50%	57%	48%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	58%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	50%	53%	37%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	62%	63%	58%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	63%	62%	52%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	51%	35%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	48%	53%	61%	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	41%	51%	-10%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	50%	1%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	64%	-11%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	49%	6%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA:
Gr3 iReady Baseline, Mid-Year, End of Year
Gr4-5 Achieve Baseline, Mid-Year, End of Year

Math:
Gr3, 4, 5 iReady Baseline, Mid-Year, End of Year

Science:
Gr5 PMA

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14%	27%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	24%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	9%	31%
	English Language Learners	0%	11%	22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6%	17%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	20%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	19%	39%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	22%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	36%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	42%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	13%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	27%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	35%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	22%
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	20%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23%	29%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	15%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	14%	30%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	40%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	36%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	28%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	29%	30%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	40%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	63%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	52%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	54%	385	34%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	25%

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	26	18	25	15	21	21				
ELL	32			56							
BLK	33	41	23	28	15	14	18				
HSP	47			50	45		64				
MUL	38			42							
WHT	52	56		52	16		45				
FRL	30	39	38	28	13	21	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	17	45	42	21	50	50	29				
ELL	12	45	47	20	81	77	20				
ASN	64			82							

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
BLK	38	51	53	45	46	41	45				
HSP	42	50	36	44	52		50				
MUL	74	70		76	70		67				
WHT	57	58	65	67	59	50	70				
FRL	37	50	49	47	51	47	39				

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	16	20	17	25	40	24	30				
ELL	25	44		28	41						
ASN	60	58		67	62						
BLK	39	37	36	52	47	35	57				
HSP	47	43	30	45	41	33	42				
MUL	68	64		69	59		64				
WHT	64	55	38	73	64	43	84				
FRL	43	41	33	54	49	34	57				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	230
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	44

English Language Learners	
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	
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	25
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	52
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
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	27
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?

Percentages decreased from the previous year for all grade levels, subgroups and content areas on the state assessment.

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

Proficiency and learning gains for students with disabilities in both Reading and Math are the priority subgroup. Additionally, overall proficiency in all grade levels for Reading and Math is a priority.

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 factor for this need for improvement is the increase in the number of students enter the school in Grade 3 who are two or more years below grade level in Reading and/or Math. Actions that need to be taken include collaboration with the Grade 2 teachers at the primary school and implementation of remediation programs including Corrective Reading, Acaletics Math, and daily teacher led small groups.

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

There were not significant improvements in state assessment data for any content areas.

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

Not applicable

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

Strategies include planning adequate time for standards based learning and differentiated remediation.
Weekly Common Planning focusing on standards based lesson planning.
Analyzing student data daily (exit tickets)) and weekly/monthly assessments to track student learning

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.

Teachers will meet weekly for grade level subject area Common Planning.
Monthly Professional Development will be provided focusing on teaching strategies and school progress.

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

Implementation of Corrective Reading and Acaletics as supported by the district
Use of Learning Arcs and Standards WalkThroughs to focus on standards based learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the Covid-19 protocols implemented for the 2020-2021 school year, parent involvement was limited to virtual and drive-thru events. The data collected through the "5Essentials Survey" continues to show a neutral rating for "Involved Families".
Measurable Outcome:	1) Parent participation in virtual, drive-thru and on-site events will increase by 10%. 2) Data on the "5Essentials Survey" will show an increase to a score of "Strong" in the "Involved Families/Parent Involvement" section
Monitoring:	1) Parent participation in virtual, drive-thru and on-site events will increase. Participation will be tracked by head counts and parent surveys. 2) Data on the "5Essentials Survey" will show an increase to a score of "Strong" in the "Involved Families/Parent Involvement" section on the 5Essentials rubric
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erin Royce (roycee@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1) Implementation of ClassDojo schoowide to be used by teachers and the school to communicate with families. 2) Use of Parent Link to send regular messages to families 3) Use of school website and social media (Twitter, Facebook and/or Instagram) to notify/ share programs, activities and PFEP events 4) Parent Liaison provides updated information about PFEP events to families using marquee, flyers, phone calls, website and social media 5) Use of mobile signage in driveways and at doors to inform families of PFEP events 6) Parent Liaison will establish and maintain a "Innovations Room" to allow families the opportunity come together to play games, read-a-loud, create craft/art, design/build lego creations, and more 7) Hold a minimum of four PFEP events to allow families to learn about literacy, math, and science standards being taught at school and how they can increase student achievement at home. Parents will be provided with materials (including books, manipulatives, and school supplies) and instruction for at home academic games and activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent involvement in all aspects of the the school will increase if parents are actively engaged and supported. By providing timely information about family events and continually informing parents using virtual platforms, we will increase parent knowledge and engagement in the school community.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Provide professional development to faculty and staff on Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
2) Create a Social Media calendar to share information regarding events

Person Responsible	Erin Royce (roycee@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The school is categorized as a "Turn Around" school for the 2021-22 school year. Additionally, the school has a D as a school grade as calculated by the district. The area of focus is to provide professional development and resources to teachers so that they can implement standards based instruction daily.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of core content teaches will use standards based protocols during PLC and Common Planning. 90% of core content teachers will rate good/strong on the Standards Walk-Through rubric Student FSA scores will increase a minimum of 10% in each scoring category. Common Planning agendas, outcomes and next steps will be monitored and tracked weekly.
Monitoring:	A minimum of 5 SWT will be conducted weekly by administration and coaches. Student data will be tracked weekly and quarterly using blended learning and district provided assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1) Reading Coach and Math Coach will provide weekly professional development to assist teachers with standards based instruction 2) Teachers will utilize poster maker and laminator to create standards based anchor charts and visuals for students 3) Teachers will use hover cameras, interactive monitors with mini computers to provide standards basked visuals for students during instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1) Teachers will understand, plan and teacher grade levels standards through professional development provided by the reading coach and math coach 2) Equipment will be added to the school in the teacher workroom to enhance student learning by allowing teachers to create vibrant classroom artifacts 3) Technology will be added to classrooms to be utilized by teaches to enhance student learning and increase standards based learning. Teachers will be able to share resources and provide clear visuals for instructional delivery

Action Steps to Implement

1) Provide professional development related to standards-based protocol
2) Collect school-wide baseline data, utilizing standards based walk-through tool
3) Monitor utilization of standards-based protocol through PLCs and standards-based walk-throughs
4) Quarterly assess the utilization of the standards-based school continuum

Person Responsible	Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2020-21 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas. o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 64%, 4th grade is 66%, and 5th grade is 61%. 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:	Amy Novak (clinea@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-intobig-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-progressmonitoring-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-teachingstrategies/

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   Amy Novak (clinea@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   Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible   Amy Novak (clinea@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

The Florida School Safety Dashboard for 2019-2020 school year reported 0.4 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. The school is ranked #35 of 97 schools in the district and #618 of 1,395 in the state.

The primary area concern is the number of violent incidents - 0.44 per 100 students.

The school goal is to be ranked in the Top 20 for the district. To meet this goal the school will implement the following strategies:
1) ClassDojo Reward & Incentive Program coordinated by classroom teachers, school administration and parent liaison
2) Bi-Weekly Guidance Lessons instructed by school counselor
3) Social Emotional Learning Daily in classrooms including Calm Classroom and Sanford Harmony instructed by classroom teachers
4) Monthly Wellness Wednesday Lessons instructed by classroom teachers
5) PBIS, CHAMPs and Restorative Justice implemented at the classroom level by teachers and the school level by administration, school counselor and behavior site coach
6) BSU Behavior Interventions implemented by the behavior site coach

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.

To build a positive school culture and environment the school implements PBIS and SEL. This includes:
Daily use of Calm Classroom and Sanford Harmony
Monthly Wellness Wednesday classroom lessons
Monthly meeting of PBIS team to collaborate with peer to identify common area/schoolwide issues and restorative justice practices
Implementation of CHAMPS schoolwide and within classrooms
Parent Liaison will help to increase parent involvement, monitor parent accounts and provide contact support
Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) with quarterly family events and activities
Use of ClassDojo for parent communication and positive student engagement

Schoolwide reward activities using ClassDojo points
Monthly Guidance lessons on character traits

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

Administration - monitors implement
PBIS Chair - facilitating teacher led committee for CHAMPS and ClassDojo
Calm Classroom Facilitator - monitors implementation of Calm Classroom
School Counselor - provides Tier 1-3 school counselor services whole group, small group, individually
SAC Committee - community input into schoolwide activities
Parent Liaison - leads PFEP activities and encourages parent involvement

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00