Duval County Public Schools

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/landon

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Casey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	30%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (84%)
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

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/landon

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	17%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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.

n/a

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Julia Landon College Preparatory and Leadership Development School is to create college bound students with a deep commitment to public service and a true understanding of their leadership skills within the global community.

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
Bledsoe, Katrina	Principal	
Bell, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Oliver, Tracey	Assistant Principal	
Mah, Erin	Teacher, ESE	
Bourgholtzer, MiChelle	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Ryan Casey

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Total number of students enrolled at the school
881

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				86%	43%	54%	87%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	49%	54%	73%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	45%	47%	68%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				91%	49%	58%	88%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				78%	50%	57%	70%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72%	47%	51%	57%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				88%	44%	51%	85%	45%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				97%	68%	72%	95%	82%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	83%	47%	36%	54%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	86%	44%	42%	52%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2021					
	2019	88%	49%	39%	56%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	91%	51%	40%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	87%	47%	40%	54%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	88%	40%	48%	48%	40%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	69%	28%	71%	26%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	57%	34%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We use PMA data to reteach, remediate, and invite students to tutoring.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
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	56	44	32	66	56	56	50	82	74		
ELL	51	55	48	67	53	55		81	55		
ASN	86	81	60	93	73	78	97	95	97		
BLK	68	59	52	73	54	58	63	96	82		
HSP	77	55	40	82	61	50	78	84	79		
MUL	83	62	42	87	65	48	81	88	92		
WHT	86	66	57	92	64	71	91	98	95		
FRL	61	57	49	63	45	41	62	88	67		
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	44	38	27	69	71	66	42	95	71		
ELL	54	46	55	69	54						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	93	74	58	97	84		100	97	98		
BLK	71	58	57	75	66	65	68	93	78		
HSP	71	56	44	86	77	70	90	91	96		
MUL	84	71	64	86	82	73		94	100		
WHT	90	70	64	96	80	76	91	100	94		
FRL	68	61	63	76	68	64	76	92	79		

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	64	71	63	58	51	33	46	75	38		
ASN	97	81	89	98	82	73	92	100	96		
BLK	71	60	55	78	67	63	78	91	75		
HSP	65	65	46	81	66	57	76	92	88		
MUL	89	81		95	75			100	100		
WHT	92	76	77	89	68	52	88	96	91		
FRL	70	64	59	73	57	53	71	92	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	74
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	740
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	67
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	67
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	72
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	80
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	59
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?

We have always seen success in proficiency across contents, however ELA continues to be the lowest with 86%.

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

ELA lowest quartile students are not making gains.

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

We need more differentiated instruction in the classroom for our lowest performing students.

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

Mathematics and Civics showed the biggest growth.

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

Consistency in teachers, great PLC's and teachers using common assessments and differentiated instruction.

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

Differentiated standards based instruction and small group instruction.

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.

MTSS Training for teachers, small group instruction training.

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

Pulled small groups of lowest performing students with support staff (admin, counselors, dean, issp)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After teachers have completed the standards based planning process and implemented their lesson plans they will ensure that they have a common standards based assessment. When teachers are assessing students after teaching a concept, the findings show that students who were already performing at or above grade level for reading proficiency continue to show proficiency in mastery of concepts presented in the assessment; whereas students who were already categorized as achieving below grade level for reading proficiency show a lack of mastery and/or adequate growth.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of our 2020-2021 core course teachers will engage in the usage of and implementation of standards based common formative assessment. The PLC format will include using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure that lesson plans created on every standard are aligned and include an assessment to know which students are proficient on the standard and which students are not, so that reteaching and reassessments can take place. After common subject and grade level teachers engage in and implement instruction delivery rooted in standards, they are to collaborate on standards based common formative assessment, to provide their students. Teachers are to upload the assessment into Performance Matters, allowing for the ability to access the exam and data dis-aggregation. Assessments are to be given when a new standard is being taught. Assessments should be a minimum of 5 questions with a maximum of 15 questions.
Monitoring:	PLC meeting minutes, Data Chats with teachers and student data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standard based common formative assessment will expose students to content specific test items, such as passages, graphs and content scenarios. Assessments are to be given once a month or when a new standard is being taught. Assessments should be a minimum of 5 questions with a maximum of 15 questions (each question should also include the standard next to the question).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The ASCD research on the use of formative assessment has shown that when teachers practice good formative assessment and students participate in it, both achievement and motivation increase. The effects of good formative assessment on achievement can be as much as .4 to .7 standard deviations, the equivalent of moving from the 50th percentile to the 65th and 75th percentile on a standardized test. The reasons of these effects and numerous. Formative assessment helps identify what students can do with help and what they can do independently. Participating in formative assessment involves students in active learning, keeps them on task, and focuses them on learning goals. Formative assessment, especially peer evaluation and self-evaluation, help students with the social construction of knowledge. But more important, formative assessment allows students to receive feedback on precisely what they need to do to improve. It shows them what to do next to get better.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development standard-based instruction as well as creating formative assessments. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible	Michelle Bell (bellm5@duvalschools.org)

Formative Assessment: Rounds with content specific teams. (Pre-planning) with the expectation that teachers will offer a minimum of two formative assessments each month.

Person Responsible Tracey Oliver (olivert@duvalschools.org)

Administration will use Standards Based Walk-throughs to both observe and monitor the formative assessments that will be given. Teachers will be required to upload onto a schoolbased calendar when they are giving an assessment (Formative, Quiz, Unit Exam)

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

Administration will meet weekly to discuss the data we are seeing across our content responsibilities:
Are we seeing common assessments?
What does that data look like in performance matters?
Are teachers conducting an item analysis of the formative assessments?
Are teachers planning for a reteach or small group dependent on what the data says?
What are you having students complete?
Is the standard posted?
Are the students able to speak to the standard?
What equivalent experiences are students experiencing daily, weekly, monthly?

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

PLC Formatting will be the same across all contents. The PLC format will include using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure that lesson plans created on every standard are aligned and include an assessment to know which students are proficient on the standard and which students are not, so that reteaching and reassessments can take place.

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

Administration will hold themselves accountable by meeting weekly uninterrupted for a minimum of of an 50 minutes about what we have seen in the minimum of 5 walk-throughs per week. We will additionally post positive feedback for teachers to see what we see going on in each content area. These positive postings will be based on the dials of the continuum (Calibrated Administration, Collaborative Administration, Standards-based Planning, Aligned Observations).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Approximately 39% of students who participate in the survey indicated that they feel very safe when in the hallways of the school. Additionally, approximately 62% of students who participated in the survey indicated they feel very safe when in teacher's classes. This was an exactly the same percentages as the previous year's survey results.
Measurable Outcome:	60% of our 2020-2021 student will feel they are very safe when they are in the hallways and in when they are in their teacher's class.
Monitoring:	Principal Focus Lunches, quarterly surveys to students
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To help students become more accountable for their actions, we need to establish routines, procedures and structures while simultaneously offering students opportunities to observe the presence of school staff members throughout the school (as well as in classrooms) monitoring and modeling appropriate behavior and good citizenship.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to ASCD, research on safe schools. A school must be safe; creating this condition requires thoughtful and constant attention to the security and safety of the facilities; creation of clear policies and procedures for students and staff conduct; frequent and effective communication with school and community stakeholders; and attention to classroom management as well as specific and relevant professional development. The absenteeism of these conditions in place, hinder student intentional learning and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development on the Supportive Environment – Student survey results and reflection. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible	MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Dissect previous year data related to ensuring a safe learning environment. School based professional development on student conduct expectations for common areas outside of the classroom (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible	MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Rounds with content grade level teams to discuss student expectations in classrooms. (Preplanning)

Person Responsible	MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Student grade level assemblies (virtual if needed) to review code of conduct expectations.

Person Responsible	MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@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.

We currently rank # 1 in a lot of areas for having low incident rates. The Drug/Public Order Incidents is our highest rate with 0.7 incidents per 100 students. We will continue to monitor and educate students on drug/vape use and what their conduct represents in every setting they can be in.

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.

We have expanded our Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies to be more inclusive and accessible to teachers and students. We built a school store where students can cash in points that teachers will give them via FOCUS.

We have an active parent group, and we are adding more ways for them to be involved on campus. Family movie nights, volunteer opportunities are just a few new additions to get more stakeholders on campus and involved.

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

Parents are key to promoting and enhancing their students learning we incorporate them as much as possible in a plethora of ways.

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: Culture & Environment: School Safety	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00