Greenland Pines Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Greenland Pines Elementary School

5050 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

http://www.duvalschools.org/greenlandpines

Demographics

Principal: Michele Hinkley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	58%
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 (64%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%)
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

Greenland Pines Elementary School

5050 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

http://www.duvalschools.org/greenlandpines

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	32%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

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.

Greenland Pines Elementary School's mission is to provide educational excellence at our school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenland Pines Elementary School's vision is a community working together to inspire and prepare all students for success in college or a career and in life.

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
Hinkley, Michelle	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Felts, Amber	Assistant Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Borden, Natalie	Teacher, ESE	Liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level which includes feedback to the Leadership Team, presentations to the faculty, work with school-based coaches, and work with small collaborative groups of teachers, and provide direct intervention services and support to students identified as needing Tier II or Tier III intervention services. Leads MRT meetings at the school level. Assists to oversee and ensure compliance with the IEP process, FBA process and other ESE related services at the school level.
King, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	CSS Site Coach: Works with self-contained CSS classroom teachers to ensure fidelity of quality program indicators as well as IEP compliance. Models and observes lessons in classrooms, assists with behavior interventions and works as the liaison between all related service providers for our CSS students and teachers.
Altom, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Provides K-5 math plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention. Provides assistance to teachers through modeling and implementation of CORE Math lessons, Blended Learning, and math centers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Michele Hinkley

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.*

4

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

695

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.

4

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	114	108	99	115	95	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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	114	108	99	115	95	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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				65%	50%	57%	60%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	56%	58%	57%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	50%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	62%	63%	69%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	63%	62%	59%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	52%	51%	49%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				75%	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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	50%	24%	56%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	57%	19%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

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.

iReady (K-2), PMA (3-5)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/21%	51/50%	78/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/10%	15/41%	23/66%
	Students With Disabilities	6/21%	9/32%	14/54%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19/18%	52/52%	79/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/21%	14/39%	24/67%
	Students With Disabilities	3/11%	11/42%	16/67%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28/28%	51/54%	64/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/28%	16/48%	17/50%
	Students With Disabilities	3/12%	6/24%	13/52%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/33%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17/17%	36/39%	55/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8%	12/39%	15/44%
	Students With Disabilities	2/8%	5/21%	9/36%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/33%	1/33%

Duval - 2491 - Greenland Pines Elem. School - 2021-22 SIP

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62/55%	66/61%	66/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/67%	14/54%	15/58%
	Students With Disabilities	7/22%	7/23%	7/22%
	English Language Learners	1/14%	3/50%	2/33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71/64%	69/63%	65/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/59%	15/58%	14/54%
	Students With Disabilities	13/41%	9/29%	11/34%
	English Language Learners	2/29%	3/50%	2/33%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46/51%	63/70%	58/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/28%	14/48%	13/50%
	Students With Disabilities	3/20%	9/56%	7/47%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64/71%	55/61%	57/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/52%	10/34%	11/42%
	Students With Disabilities	7/47%	2/13%	5/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	0/0%

Last Modified: 5/4/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 14 of 24

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49/57%	60/70%	56/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/58%	19/70%	15/60%
	Students With Disabilities	7/32%	7/32%	5/25%
	English Language Learners	1/20%	2/50%	2/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55/64%	54/63%	49/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/62%	14/52%	13/57%
	Students With Disabilities	7/32%	6/27%	3/16%
	English Language Learners	4/80%	3/75%	3/75%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/69%	61/71%	60/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/65%	15/56%	17/74%
	Students With Disabilities	9/43%	9/41%	7/37%
	English Language Learners	3/60%	2/50%	1/25%

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	26	27	10	29	33	38	36				
ELL	26			42							
ASN	74			78							
BLK	51	69		60	50		43				
HSP	41	25		38	46		46				
MUL	58			58							
WHT	62	67		71	76		83				
FRL	49	61		51	54		50				
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	29	44	46	39	49	41	43				
ELL	50			58							

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
ASN	75	64		88	86		83				
BLK	49	50	36	53	53	45	38				
HSP	42	69		46	54						
MUL	57	47		71	60						
WHT	72	74	68	79	70	54	87				
FRL	54	67	57	57	56	40	58				
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	27	29	31	38	51	54	25				
ELL	35	43		35	50						
ASN	76	74		84	65		70				
BLK	48	48		62	50	70	60				
HSP	39	29		39	52	40	33				
MUL	60	65		67	71						
WHT	63	59	32	72	59	47	62				
FRL	46	51	33	57	56	51	54				

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	60
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	49
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	76
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	55
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	39
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	58
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	72
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	53
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?

Our subgroup demonstrating the lowest performance is our Students with Disabilities at 29% proficiency in ELA. Students achievement increased from the prior year, yet still are demonstrating a slow pace of improvement. Our high number of SWD contribute to this low achievement average and we will continue to work with our teachers to provide supports for each student.

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

Our population section which had the greatest decline was our Lowest Performing Quartile Black students achieving Math Gains. The loss of the school's instructional coach was a factor for this decline. The lack of district content support also contributed to this loss.

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 section of our data that demonstrated the most improvement was our White students performing at the Lowest Performing Quartile. We see this increase attributed to the work that was done within the grade levels in small groups and the focus by tutors in the ELA instruction.

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

Our ELL students showed the most improvement in ELA moving from 35% to 50%.

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

Tutoring, RtI interventions and small group instruction by teachers and paraprofessionals.

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

Continued small group interventions focused on student needs.

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.

We will continue our regular weekly PLCs and early release professional development. In addition, this year we will add monthly WOW Wednesdays to allow us to identify and support teachers based on specific PD needs.

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

We will add an instructional coach and 3rd grade reading interventionist this year to continue to target needs for both teachers and students. We will continue quarterly data chats and progress monitoring to help identify interventions that are working and that may need tweaked.

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 previous year standards walk-through data, less than 35% (0.7 of 2.0) of the student learning tasks were aligned to the instructional delivery. We will focus school-wide professional development and collaborative planning sessions around the learning ARC to ensure student learning tasks and assessments are aligned to the standard. Through full implementation of learning ARCs and aligned tasks student performance in all academic areas will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of GPE K-5 teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction, development and implementation of learning ARCs during administrative led common planning ensuring student tasks are aligned to the full rigor and depth of the standard. Through this work, the student task alignment on the SWT dashboard will increase from 72% to 90%.
Monitoring:	Professional development will be done with teachers focused on implementation of standards-based instruction and creation of learning ARCs. Weekly common planning will take place will all ELA and math teachers in K-5 to create learning ARCs and plan for aligned instruction, and learning tasks. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development will be done with teachers focused on implementation of standards-based instruction and creation of learning ARCs. Weekly common planning will take place will all ELA and math teachers in K-5 to create learning ARCs and plan for aligned instruction,and learning tasks. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above strategies have been selected through the evidence presented in last year's SWT data. we will use the Standards Walkthough Tool to measure classroom instruction, student task alignment and assessment alignment in core classes.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize resources and reports from standards walk-through tool dashboard. Calibrate with AP and continue to use and share data frequently to ensure staff understanding and readiness. AP and principal will meet weekly and engage in conversation focused on evidence from the SWT and classroom observations to continue calibration throughout the year and discuss next steps.

Person Responsible	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Frequent classroom walk-throughs by principal and AP using SWT to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.

Person Responsible	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Quarterly teacher data chats with administration will focus on student growth through the implementation of the learning ARC, student tasks and aligned assessments. We will reflect on implementation in the classroom through focused evidence from walk-through data as well as student growth as shown through informal and formal data sets.

Person Responsible Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Engagement of all K-5 teachers in professional development based around standards-based instruction and creation of learning ARCs.

Person Responsible Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Implement Teaching Tuesday sessions monthly to allow teacher leaders to share evidence, resources, and possible action-steps for improving standards-based instruction within the classroom.

Person Responsible Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Admin will engage in weekly common planning with all K-5 teachers in the areas of ELA and/or math to create learning ARCs aligned to current instruction, create aligned student tasks and assessments and plan for implementation in all classrooms.

Person Responsible Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Provide teachers with quarterly TDE opportunities to work collaboratively to create learning ARCs, aligned tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Implementation of monthly instructional walks with teachers and admin to focus specifically on focus board and student task alignment to instruction.

Person Responsible Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through the data from the 5 Essentials survey, instructional leadership measured 31 in the effective leaders domain. Instructional leadership increased only 6 from the previous year. To this end, we will work toward creating a leadership team comprised of teachers and administrators to allow teachers to help facilitate the work and provide feedback and input. (ILT)
Measurable Outcome:	If instructional leadership increased in the building then the Effective Leaders domain (specifically the instructional leadership measure) will increase on the 2021 survey.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with instructional leaders tend to view administrators as part of a collaborative team working toward a common goal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When administrators and teachers work together toward a common goal, administrators are viewed more in the capacity of instructional leaders rather than just logistical supervisors.

Action Steps to Implement	

Create a leadership team comprised of teachers and administrators to allow teachers to help facilitate the work and provide feedback and input.

Person Responsible	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Admin will meet weekly with teachers during common planning to plan together and continue to work towards successful standards-based instruction implementation.

Person Responsible	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Regular walk-throughs, quarterly data chats, frequent feedback and teacher-admin conversations about instruction will take place with both the principal and AP in all classrooms.

Person Responsible	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From the 5 Essentials survey, collective responsibility was the lowest measure in the collaborative teachers domain. Collective responsibility scored at 3 and increased only 2 from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	If instructional leadership increased in the building then the Collaborative Teachers domain (specifically the teacher-teacher trust measure) will increase on the 2021 survey.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with higher culture and climate ratings tend to work efficiently to solve problems that may arise in the school including how to best serve students and families and how to support each other professionally through modeling of excellent instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If the school is able to have a solid teacher to teacher trust, we will more consistently be able to support each other and students.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a plan for team building activities.

Person Responsible	Amber Felts (feltsa@duvalschools.org)

Provide opportunities for relationship building and professional discourse regularly within the school.

Person Responsible	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate with one another in non-threatening environments. Implement Teaching Tuesday (led by teachers) to allow teachers opportunities to share ideas and resources that are having a positive impact on standards based instruction and student growth within their classrooms.

Person Responsible	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@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.

Our primary focus in terms of student discipline will be bus safety. Both the principal and AP will continue to monitor bus behavior and have assemblies with students to reinforce positive bus behavior and establish clear rules.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, positivity and responsibility. We will do this by partnering with PTA to provide opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through certain events such as Family Movie Nights, Family Dances, Math Night, Literacy Night, Student Conference night etc.. These events will also involve other stakeholders such as business partners as well as our faith-based partners. Internally, administration works with our hospitality committee to promote a positive culture and climate for staff through monthly team-building and culture-building activities.

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

At Greenland Pines, we have numerous stakeholder groups that contribute to promoting a positive culture and environment including PTA, SAC, faith-based partners, business partners, students and faculty/staff.