

Duval County Public Schools

# Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

## Demographics

Principal: **Cassandra Delay N**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">64%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">47%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Grade</b>		B	B	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.

Sheffield 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.

Sheffield 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
DeLay, Cassandra	Principal	
Weber, Monica	Assistant Principal	
Gilyard, Jeanna	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Cassandra Delay N

**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.*

3

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

49

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

625

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

5

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

5

#### 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	110	132	105	114	109	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	25	28	21	21	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	4	8	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	3	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	56	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	23	26	21	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

**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	13	44	24	19	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	142	120	111	119	127	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	23	14	15	21	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	54	65	63	38	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	64	81	66	56	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316

**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	52	59	57	40	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244

**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	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	142	120	111	119	127	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	23	14	15	21	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	54	65	63	38	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	64	81	66	56	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316

**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	52	59	57	40	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244

**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	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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				62%	50%	57%	59%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	58%	55%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	50%	53%	47%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	62%	63%	72%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	63%	62%	66%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	51%	52%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	48%	53%	75%	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	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	50%	8%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	73%	64%	9%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	49%	15%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

KG-2 i-Ready  
3-5 PMA

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		37/27%	53/41%	85/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged		10/17%	16/30%	30/55%
	Students With Disabilities		2/11%	2/13%	7/44%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		16/12%	32/24%	74/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged		8/14%	8/15%	26/46%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	2/13%	10/63%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

<b>Grade 2</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/36%	52/47%	65/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/25%	14/36%	16/46%
	Students With Disabilities	2/8%	3/12%	8/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/13%	28/25%	53/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/10%	4/10%	9/26%
	Students With Disabilities	3/12%	1/4%	3/13%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
<b>Grade 3</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57/55%	73/70%	72/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/50%	26/62%	23/50%
	Students With Disabilities	6/21%	13/46%	9/30%
	English Language Learners	1/25%	3/75%	3/60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59/57%	63/61%	63/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/45%	18/43%	16/35%
	Students With Disabilities	14/50%	9/32%	7/23%
	English Language Learners	3/75%	2/50%	3/60%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49/46%	69/63%	62/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/27%	15/38%	16/43%
	Students With Disabilities	8/23%	10/29%	11/31%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	0/0%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/67%	58/53%	65/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/43%	11/28%	12/32%
	Students With Disabilities	15/43%	11/31%	14/40%
	English Language Learners	2/67%	0/0%	1/33%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56/50%	77/69%	84/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/47%	26/57%	31/62%
	Students With Disabilities	7/24%	10/36%	12/40%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57/51%	47%	48/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/40%	15/33%	15/30%
	Students With Disabilities	6/21%	4/14%	5/17%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	63/56%	73/65%	78/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/45%	24/54%	30/60%
	Students With Disabilities	8/28%	11/39%	11/37%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	45	38	40	65	65	26				
ELL	73			82							
BLK	55	64		61	68		55				
HSP	52			59							
MUL	71			62							
WHT	61	60	33	69	69	63	61				
FRL	47	52	45	54	67	53	49				
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	28	37	45	40	53	41	37				
ELL											
BLK	51	48	29	58	59	44	56				
HSP	71	78		77	74						
MUL	70	73		81	73						
WHT	65	63	60	71	62	37	72				
FRL	53	57	47	51	57	44	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	23	38	38	40	60	56	30				
BLK	51	56	43	67	66	57	57				
HSP	70	62		74	69		76				
MUL	70	62		74	62		90				
WHT	60	52	46	75	66	48	81				
FRL	53	54	50	64	67	51	67				

**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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	78
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
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	59
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	52
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?**

SWD sub-group shows the lowest performance. This sub-group has significant academic deficiencies and many are working multiple grade levels below their current grade level.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline for the 2018-2019 school year. Our fifth grade students in 2018-2019 were 8% lower in science proficiency than our fifth grade students from the previous year.

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

Our greatest gap was in math LPQ. Sheffield Elementary was at 45% while the state was at 51%. This is an area of increased focus and we will be implementing and tracking monthly student data in order to assess effectiveness of instruction and curriculum. Many of our students have gaps in their learning and while they are making growth, it is not enough to show gains on a grade level assessment.

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

At Sheffield Elementary, our ELA LPQ showed the largest growth with an increase of 5% from 2018 to 2019. Our school had a priority focus on these students and we were very intentional with our actions last year. All of our ELA LPQ received instruction in LLI last year.



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

Focused in-school tutoring with certificated tutors. Tutors focused on standards that scored significantly lower on informal and formal assessments. Continue small group interventions and Rtl.

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

Continue with the strategies listed above focusing 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.**

Professional development and PLCs

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

Add an instructional coach to continue to target needs. Continue with quarterly data chats to progress monitor students and provide necessary interventions for improvement.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on previous year Standards Walkthrough data, less than 40% (0.8 out of 2.0 on the dial) student learning tasks were aligned to the instructional delivery. We will focus on the learning ARC to ensure learning tasks and assessments are aligned to the standard. Through full implementation of learning ARCs, aligned tasks and assessments, student performance in all academic areas will increase.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	All of LSE's current KG-5 teachers will engage in successful standards based instructional planning, development and implementation of learning ARCs during administratively led common planning and PLCs, ensuring the tasks and assessments meet the full rigor and depth of the standard. Through doing this, the student task alignment area on the Standards Walkthrough tool will increase by 1.0 (from 0.8 to 1.8).
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The above strategies have been selected through the evidence presented in last year's Standards Walkthrough data. We will use the Standards Walkthrough Tool to measure classroom instruction, student task alignment and assessment alignment in core classes.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Professional development will be done with teachers focused on standards-based tiered instruction. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the quality and fidelity of tiered instruction, as well as student tasks and assessments.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The above strategies have been selected through the evidence presented in last year's Standards Walkthrough data. We will use the Standards Walkthrough Tool to measure classroom instruction, student task alignment and assessment alignment in core classes.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilizing resources and reports from Standards Based Walkthrough data.
2. Analyze student work and assessment data to ensure the tasks are aligned and assessment are aligned to the standard.
3. Learning ARC that are developed during common planning and PLCs.
4. Frequent classroom walkthroughs using the SWT.
5. Quarterly data chats with administration will focus on student growth through the implementation of the learning ARC, tasks and assessments. We will reflect on implementation and focus on tiered instruction.
6. Professional Development based around standards based instruction and alignment.
7. There will be collaboration across the grade levels to ensure that teachers are aligning their tiered instruction based on the previous grade levels ARC.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

## #2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on the 5 Essentials survey, Teacher Principal Trust was the lowest measure in the Effective Leader category. It scored at 43 neutral and decreased by 5 from the previous year.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	If Teacher Principal Trust increases, then the Effective Leaders domain, will increase on the 2021-2022 5 Essentials survey.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This will be monitored through survey and Monday morning check ins as well as quarterly conversations with teachers.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Schools with effective leader 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.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	If the school is able to have a solid teacher to teacher trust, they will more consistently be able to support each other and students.

### Action Steps to Implement

- Weekly newsletters (Panther Post)
- Daily Debrief
- Open door policy
- All faculty members have Principal cell phone numbers
- Immediate response to email, phone and text
- Monday Morning Surveys to faculty
- Quarterly check-ins with teachers individually (just the principal and the teacher); monthly with teachers that have asked for more
- Providing more opportunities of leadership roles for the teachers

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on the 5 Essentials survey, Safety was the lowest measure in the Supportive Environment category. It scored at 40 neutral however, it did increase by 4 from the previous.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	If Safety increases in students, then the Supportive Environment domain, will increase on the 2021-2022 5 Essentials survey.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Monthly drills, foundations meetings, feedback from teachers and students.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Schools with higher safety ratings tend to provide opportunities for students to feel safe and also voice their concerns.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	If the school is able to provide an environment where students feel safe, students will be more focused on their academic learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- PBIS for all areas of the school
- Positive referrals for bus behavior
- Bus of the Week
- Safety assemblies
- Monthly Drills (Different times of the day and different areas this year)
- Monthly Safety and referral updates with teachers
- Monthly PBIS meeting
- Quarterly PBIS Newsletters (teachers and parents)
- Students request individual counseling
- Teacher counseling referrals
- Conduct focus group interviews with 4th and 5th grade students at the beginning of the 2nd and 4th nine weeks to get students to view their perception of safety throughout the different areas of campus and among their peers, faculty, and staff. Safety ambassadors and restorative practice groups with students in 3rd – 5th.
- Through the PBIS Team create strategies/events/activities for students (dependent on student feedback from focus groups) that promote safety and teach students about safety around campus. Strategies are to include student suggestions from focus groups.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#4. 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 31%, 4th grade is 54%, and 5th grade is 34%.

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:**

Cassandra DeLay (delayc@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** Cassandra DeLay (delayc@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** Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible** Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.com, below are the total reported suspensions:**

**2014 - 62**

**2015 - 30**

**2016 - 27**

**2017 - 33**

**2018 - 38**

**2019 - 30**

**As the data shows, our referrals have been steadily decreasing. Many of our referrals come from our Behavior Support Units.**

**These additional areas will be addressed through grade level leads, shared decision making, content area experts, school advisory counsel, PTA, faith based partners and other stakeholders 2021-2022**

#### **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, and responsibility. We will do this by providing 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.

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

The entire leadership team takes responsibility for promoting the positive school culture. We have calendars of incentives and fun items for teachers. As well as surveys that the teachers complete to help us gauge how things are going.

## 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: Leadership: Leadership Development	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>