

Duval County Public Schools

Chaffee Trail Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Chaffee Trail Elementary

11400 SAM CARUSO WAY, Jacksonville, FL 32221

<http://www.duvalschools.org/chaffee-trail>

Demographics

Principal: Casie Doyle L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Chaffee Trail Elementary

11400 SAM CARUSO WAY, Jacksonville, FL 32221

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

To Provide the basis for all students to become life long learners and well rounded citizens

Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage all students in meaningful work, Empower them to become responsible for their own learning, So that they Excel as productive citizens.

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
Doyle, Casie	Principal	Principal - Instructional Leader Math/Reading, Parent communication, community events, Teacher PD plan, School safety and Responder team, Employee evaluation and recognition programs, Covid documenting and q and A person, SAC and Steering Chair, Data Goal's Vision Mission, SIP focus. AP - Discipline, Testing, SESIR, Instructional Leader Math - Reading, volunteers, Patrols, Extended day, Code Red Team. Guidance Counselor - IEP reviews - MTSS organization, classroom counselor visits, calm classroom, Sanford Harmony, Lunch and Learn group sessions, SLA - Lead - supports IEP review, teacher support for strategies and best practices, Organization of resources for students needs, schedules for Ot/Pt, VE services, Speech, language, etc. Reading Coach - plans and delivers PD and pulls small groups daily for support, Supports new teacher program, PDF Math/Science Coach - plans and delivers PD, pulls small groups.
Wright, Marquita	Assistant Principal	
Sherman, Katherine	School Counselor	
Slawson, Shauna	Teacher, ESE	
Stuckey, Terry	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/21/2021, Casie Doyle L

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

721

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	117	111	119	123	119	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	746
Attendance below 90 percent	2	27	36	36	39	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	30	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	7	51	43	35	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	48	47	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	3	12	56	43	34	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	3	1	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/21/2021

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	1	2	12	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	6	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	3	4	22	43	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	12	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	6	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	3	4	22	43	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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				53%	50%	57%	55%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	55%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	42%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	62%	63%	72%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	63%	62%	75%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	51%	67%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	48%	53%	59%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	51%	-4%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	64%	13%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	60%	49%	11%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-2 iReady Baseline, Mid year and end of year

3-5 Freckle, Achieve, PMA's quarterly

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

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

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

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	36	43	27	50	45		35				
BLK	45	43	33	51	40	8	37				
HSP	32			23	30						
MUL	64			53							
WHT	64	63	58	70	62	40	66				
FRL	48	48	50	48	46	22	45				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	50	47	45	50	59	35				
ELL	33	30		42	50						
BLK	43	50	45	61	61	52	43				
HSP	36	31		56	62						

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
MUL	61	67		72	73						
WHT	67	59	67	81	75	73	76				
FRL	49	56	48	65	59	53	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	30	45	40	41	63	67	33				
ASN	80	60		90	90						
BLK	43	46	33	61	77	73	37				
HSP	57	90		67	55						
MUL	64	63		60	69		70				
WHT	62	57	50	82	75	70	71				
FRL	48	52	46	63	69	63	48				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
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	28
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	59
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	60
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	44
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?

lowest 25% ELA- management of time spent on rti, and differentiating the use of whole group to meet the needs of groups of students rather than one size fits all.

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

Math Gains- decrease from years prior....3rd grade scores Reading and Math have the most room to grow in this area

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

virtual learning the spring prior and the number of student who again remained in virtual learning for part if not all of their 3rd grade year. Actions taken- No more virtual learning at the school base but through DVIA

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

n

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

n

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

Direct instruction for students in 3rd grade with more than one year deficit in reading and math.

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.

Corrective reading PD
Math Focus Group/studies

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

n

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	State assessments as well as district assessments indicate a downward trend in 3rd grade reading and math proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency levels Reading 60% Math 60%
Monitoring:	Reading will be monitored via classroom walk throughs, CLC reviews of data, Corrective reading instruction measurements, and quarterly district PMA's Math will be monitored via classroom walk throughs, CLC reviews of data, Freckle lessons and small group assessments, and quarterly district PMA's
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Corrective reading for students who are performing one year or more below grade level Math students who fall below grade level on the fall benchmark - small group tool box instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	both strategies provide instruction and practice specific to the students defined need

Action Steps to Implement

Corrective Reading and small group lessons - Terry Stuckey Instructional Coach
Increased time spent in small group instruction, using corrective reading, LLI, and Freckle. Additional supports for individualized student achievement goals will be delivered with the assistance of our instructional coach, tutors, media specialist and additional para supports. We will incorporate technology in the classroom that will benefit student engagement and in turn achievement such as doc cameras, microphones and smart boards. Our Parent Liaison will be key in building up the use of our parent resource room to encourage and allow for better parent partnership in home learning for students. In addition we will incorporate the use of Practice Coach books and other store room supplies to support the learning in our tutor groups and small remediation groups. In addition to using LLI, Barton, Corrective Reading, Freckle Lessons, etc

Person Responsible Terry Stuckey (stuckeyt@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Trend data showing a decrease over the past 4 years in proficiency in reading and math. An effective Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) helps a school improve teaching and learning through increased collaboration and distributive leadership. Schools with strong ILTs are more effective at assessing the progress of teachers and students and making adjustments as needed.

Measurable Outcome: Reading proficiency in 2021 was 53 our school goal for 2022 is 60%
 Reading LPQ in 2021 was 46% our school goal for 2022 is 55%
 Math proficiency in 2021 was 57% our school goal for 2022 is 65%
 Math LPQ in 2021 was 21% our school goal for 2022 is 55%

Monitoring: ILT monthly meetings - standard based planning using the ARC
 ILT quarterly data review - data chat
 CLC - data chats and lesson planning

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: implementing data protocols, support the ILT to assess school-wide teacher and student data and make recommendations for areas to focus through out the year.

Continuous learning cycles and walk through observations: ILT members will observe each other teach a standards based lesson and/or coach, and practice providing each other feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Interpreting data allows teachers to identify the strengths and weaknesses of an entire class as well as individual students. As they examine the data, teachers can develop hypotheses about factors that affect students' learning and ways to improve instruction to help all students achieve.

With this CLC we can determine or refine student learning goals in alignment with a vision of good teaching and learning that is rooted in the standards and their depth.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Our data on from 2020-21 Standards based dashboard shows a deficit in student ability to demonstrate their knowledge of the standard being delivered in the instruction as well as the task used to demonstrate students knowledge of the standard is often less than grade level/standard. The task often demonstrates minimal proficiency of the standard. Moving forward this year our goal is that Instruction will match depth, breadth and scope of grade level standard to ensure that student can show proficiency at grade level. Based on our standards walk through we found that while the teachers instruction covered the standard at grade level the assessment piece often did not align with the rigor of grade level standard. The goal is to use clc planning time to work around creating learning arcs for the standards. This will guide us in developing exit slips and formatives that asses the standard at minimally a level 3 proficiency while giving students opportunities to stretch into levels 4&5. In addition, the goal is to promote students discourse around the standard during each portion of the lesson from start to finish.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

All of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards based instruction, planning procedures, reviewing and designing assessment/ task resulting in a rating of 1.5 or greater on the district Walk Though Rubric. Student accountable talk around the standard will increase to a vast majority on the rubric.

Monitoring:

CLC meetings and Admin walkthroughs.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Meaningful CLC that produces lessons and formatives that ensures students are not only exposed to standards aligned instruction, but as well the task and assessments given to students are aligned with appropriate grade level requirements. They will demonstrate the rigor needed to exemplify and score minimally at a level 3 proficiency. Ultimately the student will be given opportunities to demonstrate knowledge and performance at a level 4 or 5 level. Guiding questions that prompt student conversation that demonstrates metacognition of the lesson and standard These will consistently be a part of our clc planning session products. Based on standard walk through tool, the admin team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experience.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

The rationale is to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD account for over 30% of our students in the Lowest Performing Quartile with less than half showing a years growth counting toward student gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Students With Disabilities will have a goal of 65%, making a years worth of growth in reading and math according to the FSA for grades 3-5 and iready diagnostics for grades k-2.
Monitoring:	We will monitor progress in our clc meetings with data check- ins and remediation small group planning time with grade level varying exceptionalities teacher and general education teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Sherman (shermank@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Reading k-2 - we will continue to implement and monitor Reading Mastery and small group remediation time</p> <p>Math k-2- we will use iready data to create small group push in supports during center time</p> <p>Reading 3-5 - we will use corrective reading and monitor progress. we will review small group implementation using most recent data to target the needs of the students.</p> <p>Math 3-5 - we will use freckle to support our push- in remediation and support small groups</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These resources are readily available. Teachers have a year under their belt implementing them and can build their professional knowledge on the resource and provide for more successful supports.
Action Steps to Implement	
review SWD and LPQ data with clc groups - plan for small group instruction and future data check-ins as a team(VE teacher and General Ed teacher) with admin and Reading or Math Coach.	
Person Responsible	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)

#5. Other specifically relating to 5essentials -teacher collaboration

Area of Focus	The identified area of focus on our annual 5essential survey is teacher collaboration.
Description and Rationale:	Specifically teachers working together towards a common goal and spending time observing other classrooms to grow professionally.
Measurable Outcome:	75% of teachers will have the opportunity to take part in the coaching cycle with a peer group. They will plan series of lessons using the learning arc and observe minimally 1 peer classroom arc lesson on the chosen standard.
Monitoring:	We will use admin common planning time for the coaching cycle and will organize a revolving schedule for the observation times. Teachers will provide peer feedback and an exit slip at the close of the coaching cycle to decide next steps in our school for continued growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Coaching Cycle will be focused on a school wide goal of increased engagement of students during their standards based lesson. Early Dismissal time will provide for professional development in strategies for students centered discourse. Grade level CLC's will develop strategies for student initiated discussion increasing engagement with the standards based lesson. A calendar will be created for teachers to observe engagement in classrooms are vertically aligned.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected at teachers request during our post conversations surrounding the 5 essential feedback survey. They wanted to increase the time they had in watching others and working together on a common goal to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on 2021-22 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 53%, 4th grade is 39%, and 5th grade is 50%.

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:

Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-into-big-wins>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progress-monitoring-improves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. <https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teaching-strategies/>

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

Person Responsible Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@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 Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@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.

Primary - out of school suspension

Secondary - in school suspensions

PBIS monthly PLC meetings with admin

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.

Communication, Availability, and Visibility are key in creating a positive and safe learning environment.

Communication - We have multiple systems in place to ensure stakeholders are informed (robocallouts, social media, school webpage, teacher text platforms, and quarterly newsletters).

Community events - events that allow stakeholders to partner with the school in collaborating for student success. During these event the admin team and teacher are present to answer questions and or provide additional supports.

Visibility - the admin team is visible for morning arrival and dismissal as well as all stakeholder events this creates a sense of partnership with the public. We have also been told by our stakeholders that being able to see us daily makes them feel safer about their students being here on campus through out the day.

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

We report out our data from the 5 E survey setting goals to improve each area of concern in the following stakeholder committee meetings in August :

STEERING Committee

PTA Family Night/PTA board meeting

SAC committee

CTES Leadership Team

Title I family students success family night

All of these stakeholder groups meet on a monthly basis for continued collaboration on goals and problem solving obstacles.

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: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: 5essentials -teacher collaboration	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00