Neptune Beach Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
mission
students
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
resources
areas of focus
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Neptune Beach Elementary School

1515 FLORIDA BLVD, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

http://www.duvalschools.org/nbe

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Kavanagh

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2009

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)	51%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (74%)
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

Neptune Beach Elementary School

1515 FLORIDA BLVD, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

http://www.duvalschools.org/nbe

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	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We fully commit ourselves to every child's individual pathway to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will know how to apply the skills they learn to their 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
Kavanagh, Elizabeth	Principal	The school-based Leadership Team will meet weekly. The meetings will be designed to review data and to help with plans and instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly,problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The aforementioned team (or select members thereof) will review all Tier 2/3, Overage & One Plus year retained students. Formative and summative diagnostic material will be reviewed to determine areas of focus and to develop prescriptive measures. Evaluation will then occur and the cycle will repeat or expand as needed. Any student referred to Multi-Tiered Support Systems (MTSS) for consideration of Exceptional Student Education (ESE) will be reviewed by the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) leadership team for supporting documentation.
Baxter, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Forte, Brooke	School Counselor	
Darcy, Marylou	Teacher, ESE	
Wine, Shannon	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 8/1/2009, Elizabeth Kavanagh

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.*
7

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

0

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

1

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	115	128	120	108	112	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	712
Attendance below 90 percent	26	22	32	23	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	3	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	2	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	20	20	23	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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	16	19	34	25	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Wednesday 7/28/2021

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	146	142	112	121	151	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	8	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	3	6	1	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	7	8	16	41	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	3	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	146	142	112	121	151	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	8	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	3	6	1	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	7	8	16	41	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	3	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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				77%	50%	57%	73%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	56%	58%	61%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	50%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				86%	62%	63%	83%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				85%	63%	62%	80%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74%	52%	51%	61%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				78%	48%	53%	81%	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	78%	51%	27%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	52%	22%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	50%	27%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	84%	61%	23%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	91%	57%	34%	60%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	77%	49%	28%	53%	24%
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 tool used was I-Ready.
3-5 tool used was Progress Monitoring Assessments 1, 2, and 3.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	57	92
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	12	21
	Students With Disabilities	2	3	5
	English Language Learners	0	1	1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	40	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	1	5	21
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	5
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23	49	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	8	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	7
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	19	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	1	8
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	26	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	5	7
	Students With Disabilities	2	1	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	51	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	8	5
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	3
	English Language Learners	0	1	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	64	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	13	10
	Students With Disabilities	5	4	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	38	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	9	14
	Students With Disabilities	4	1	5
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	52	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	13	17
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	38	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	7	13
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	5
	English Language Learners	1	0	2
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	50	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	12	10
	Students With Disabilities	8	4	1
	English Language Learners	2	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	42	37	20	42	47	23	26				
ELL	54			62							
BLK	55	50	45	49	50	50	19				
HSP	63	52		73	67		36				
MUL	74	50		81	80		67				
WHT	74	66		80	62	30	68				
FRL	55	50	26	58	48	30	38				
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	48	52	39	68	81	74	46				
ELL	50	60		75	80						
BLK	47	48	24	70	73	71	31				

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
HSP	71	74	82	80	85		77				
MUL	73	63		83	78						
WHT	84	67	48	90	88	74	86				
FRL	63	60	38	77	76	65	68				
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	51	47	42	65	56	39	73				
ELL	50			70							
ASN	80			100							
BLK	43	46	35	61	63	50	50				
HSP	73	66		79	69		88				
MUL	86	62		100	100						
WHT	79	63	43	86	83	64	84				
FRL	62	56	46	76	78	66	70				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	45
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	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
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?

Student proficiency increased across all grade levels in ELA and math from fall to the spring diagnostic. All subgroups showed an increase in proficiency from the fall to spring, although at not as high a percentage as the overall proficiency throughout each grade level.

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

The greatest need for improvement from the data is to increase the proficiency level of the economically disadvantage and the students with disabilities. Although each subgroup showed gains, they still fell significantly behind the percentage of overall students who were proficient on each diagnostic.

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

A concentrated effort to monitor and track students in each subgroup. Focus common planning, coaching, and professional development to improve the Tier II and Tier III instruction within the classroom that focus on improving the percentage of students within each subgroup.

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

The most improvement came from K-2 and 5th grade reading and math proficient students. Each grade level showed tremendous growth from the fall to spring diagnostics.

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

Teachers collaborating and working together to improve lesson plans and discuss the best teaching practices to improve student achievement.

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

Teachers viewing other teachers lessons, discussing collaboratively best practices they saw, and giving feedback to improve instruction.
Administrative walkthroughs with immediate feedback to improve classroom teaching.
Direct and explicit common planning, professional development, and coaching through the collection of data.

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 that improves the instruction of all Tier II and Tier III students.
Instructional coach working with teachers and administrators improving lesson delivery, common planning, and professional development.
Instructional coach working with Tier II and Tier III students.

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

Improved collaboration between general education teachers and VE teachers. Standard based walkthroughs peer-to-peer teaching with immediate feedback.
Development and ongoing common planning that provides teachers with the tools they need to grow and improve as a classroom teacher.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Highly effective professional development impacts student learning through administrative support, monitoring of implementation of the professional development, and giving timely and valuable feedback to each teacher. Using data collected from the 5Essential survey and Standard Walkthrough data, the areas in professional learning that needed improvement were; providing timely feedback to teachers, observing other classroom teachers, monitoring the implementation of professional development that was just taught, assessing student learning, and providing support for the teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	The overall outcome from the 5Essential survey at the end of the year will show a 90% increase in feedback, professional development, observing teachers, and improved support.
Monitoring:	Descriptive minutes from common planning will be taken during leadership team lead common planning, instructional coach led common planning, and grade-level meetings. Teacher and administrative walkthrough forms will be discussed with immediate feedback given to each teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Kavanagh (kavanaghe@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Comparing the 5Essential survey data from the 2019-2020 to the 2020-2021 school years, 49% of the staff determined these areas were needing improvement; providing timely feedback to teachers after going into their classroom, observing other teachers, monitoring the implementation of professional development that was just taught, and providing support for teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing and designing highly effective professional development with the assistance of teachers. After implementing the professional development training, leadership will fully support, monitor, and give valuable feedback allowing for teacher and student growth. Neptune Beach Elementary will ensure that student assessment experience is equivalent to state standards. This may include, but is not limited to, item specifications, appropriate item types, assessment limits, along with students progressing yearly with the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and administrators visit classroom teachers during common planning. Teachers and administrators meet to discuss lesson and give constructive feedback.
2. Teachers meet bi-weekly with leadership team to discuss and implement professional development ideas through the collection of data.
3. Classroom walkthroughs with explicit and timely feedback to promote and drive the ongoing classroom instruction.
4. Common planning will be developed by administration and instructional coach through the collection of data and the collaboration with teachers.
5. During the first four weeks of school the administrative team will conduct classroom walkthroughs and calibrate together using the Standard Walkthrough Tool.
6. Administration will meet regularly to discuss findings from classroom walkthroughs and have rich conversations to develop next steps.

Person Responsible Shannon Wine (wines@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The overall proficiency from Tier III, economic disadvantaged, and students with disabilities has decreased in reading, math, and science compared to the growth of all students in grades 3, 4, and 5. The average proficient rate for these subgroups are 15% on PMA 3 compared to 51% of all students who took PMA 3.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase the proficiency level of the subgroups; Tier III, economic disadvantaged, and students with disabilities by an average of 15% to close the gap between all the the students in grades 3, 4, and 5.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored with monthly data meetings with teachers, instructional coach, and administration that targets the students within the subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through design, rigor, and implementation of professional development to engage and improve teacher knowledge throughout the school year in the areas of lower performing students, writing, and disaggregating data (preplanning, common planning, after school training's) will lead to increasing the proficiency level of the Tier III, economic disadvantage, and students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The overall proficiency level of the Tier III, economic disadvantaged, and students with disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5 are at 15%. Through the collection of 2020/2021 PMA data of all 3, 4, and 5th grade students, the gap of proficient students in these subgroups and all students had grown larger.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers visit model classrooms to enhance implementation of small group instruction with Tier III, economic disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.
2. Teachers meet bi-weekly with leadership team to discuss explicit points to improve student achievement.
3. Implement professional development for LLI, Achieve 3000, i-Ready, Gizmos, Study Island, and Top Score to assist with successfully incorporating these resources within the classroom.
4. Utilize tutors/mentors, instructional coach, and materials to provide support and instruction for identified students.
5. Classroom walkthroughs with explicit and timely feedback to promote and drive the ongoing classroom instruction to improve student gains.
6. Re-aligned teachers within the intermediate grade levels to improve our overall literacy proficiency.

Person Responsible Kevin Baxter (baxterk@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.

At Neptune Beach Elementary School, the Virtual Teachers monitored students discipline through constant communication and positive reinforcement. During the 2020-2021 school year, Neptune Beach had a minimal amount of discipline. The area of concerns came from a small group of students. Due to incentivizing students, positive reinforcement, and persistent monitoring, our students modeled our expected Manatee Mission by treating others with respect, making good choices, and obeying school rules. The Manatee Mission is pledged by each student every morning during the morning announcements. This is a constant reminder for students to practice being the best person that they can be.

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.

Neptune Beach has a strong Positive Behavior Intervention Team (PBIS) that works hard to improve the culture and environment of Neptune Beach. The school is in the process of applying to become a model school within the district. This emphasizes and models a positive school culture where other schools within the district emulate strategies used by Neptune Beach that promotes a positive school environment. Strategies are implemented within this program, such as improving school-wide positive referrals for students that match Neptune Beach's Manatee Mission.

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

The school works closely with our Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Volunteer Coordinator, and external community to recruit volunteers and Business Partners. Our goal is to increase the number of parents participating in at least one parent education event that includes Open House, Volunteer and Business Partner Orientation, Literacy Night, Math Night, Science Night, SAC, and PTA. The school's mission and vision are shared during Open House, as well as during our Volunteer/Business Partner Orientation, and our school website. Teachers are expected to utilize the District Progress Report schedule to inform parents of student progress. Many teachers use Shutterfly, Class Dojo, and other instructional technologies to communicate with their parents.
Neptune Beach prides itself with many different stakeholders that address building a positive

culture and environment:

- Well attended School Advisory Council comprised of teachers, community members, and parents that assists with building a positive environment and supporting rigorous academics at Neptune Beach Elementary.

-Programs such as Safety Patrols, Teachers of Tomorrow (TOTS), Girls on the Run, and Manatee Milers, which encourage positive behavior and high academic standards, that students strive to meet.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**