Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

http://www.duvalschools.org/tlam

Demographics

Principal: Aurelia Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

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)	72%
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* Native American Students* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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

Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

http://www.duvalschools.org/tlam

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	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide every student, in every classroom, every day with a safe, caring, engaging and challenging learning environment that promotes the rigorous and relevant educational experiences necessary to perform at or above grade level standards.

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
Williams, Aurelia	Principal	Facilitate the leadership team meetings where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Shaw, Sharonette	Assistant Principal	As the Math Instructional Lead and AP of Curriculum, AP Shaw assist with facilitating the leadership meetings where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Jones, David	Teacher, K-12	As the Science Department Chair, Mr. Jones will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Brown, Gregory	Teacher, K-12	As the ELA Department Chair, Mr. Brown will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Carter, Anoda	Instructional Technology	As the Technology Department Chair, Ms. Carter will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Bryan, Molly	Teacher, ESE	As the FRVE, Ms. Bryan will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Bolden, Myra	Teacher, K-12	As the Math Department Chair, Ms. Bolden will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Curry, Sequan	School Counselor	As the School Counselor, Mr. Curry will review academic and behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact all

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students postsecondary education.
Madison, Felecia	Teacher, K-12	As the Social Studies Department Chair, Mrs. Madison will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Van De Guchte, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	As the Gifted Lead Teacher, Mrs. Van De Guchte will where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for gifted students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares gifted students for postsecondary education.
Copeland, Daniel	Assistant Principal	As the Science and Social Studies Instructional Lead and AP of Student Services, AP Copeland will assist with facilitating the leadership meetings where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
James, Francesca	School Counselor	As the School Counselor, Ms. James will review academic and behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact ESOL students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares ESOL students postsecondary education.
Story, Godfrey	Dean	As the Dean, Mr. Story will review behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students postsecondary education.
Branch, Ariel	Teacher, K-12	As the Reading and ESOL Language Development Teacher, Ms. Branch will review academic Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact Intensive Reading/ESOL Language Development students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students postsecondary education.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/28/2021, Aurelia Williams

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

4

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

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,131

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	463	389	379	0	0	0	0	1231
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	68	55	0	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	81	48	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	13	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	13	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	293	173	73	0	0	0	0	539
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	245	271	239	0	0	0	0	755
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	235	210	0	125	0	0	0	570

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	6	13	8	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	12

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	410	402	421	0	0	0	0	1233
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	29	49	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	60	46	0	0	0	0	202
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	123	133	0	0	0	0	359
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	140	151	0	0	0	0	401

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	100	113	114	0	0	0	0	327

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	22

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	410	402	421	0	0	0	0	1233
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	29	49	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	60	46	0	0	0	0	202
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	123	133	0	0	0	0	359
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	140	151	0	0	0	0	401

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	100	113	114	0	0	0	0	327

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	22

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				48%	43%	54%	46%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	49%	54%	48%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	45%	47%	36%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				53%	49%	58%	52%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				51%	50%	57%	58%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	47%	51%	52%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				57%	44%	51%	52%	45%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	68%	72%	96%	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	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	49%	5%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	37%	47%	-10%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	32%	32%	0%	46%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	44%	40%	4%	48%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	67%	30%	67%	30%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	69%	3%	71%	1%

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	79%	57%	22%	61%	18%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	61%	37%	57%	41%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

All grade levels (6th-8th) for each subgroup used PMAs to compile the data below.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46%	45%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	41%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	17%	21%
	English Language Learners	6%	14%	10%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	46%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	39%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	10%	16%
	English Language Learners	11%	6%	18%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47%	52%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	45%	34%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	29%	16%
	English Language Learners	22%	18%	12%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50%	48%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	38%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	28%	23%	19%
	English Language Learners	27%	23%	20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	64%	64%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	50%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	61%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	52%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	30%	27%
	English Language Learners	8%	13%	13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49%	47%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	41%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	38%	44%
	English Language Learners	24%	19%	25%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	52%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	44%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	20%	28%
	English Language Learners	11%	11%	15%

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	9	23	29	12	24	27	13	49			
ELL	18	36	31	23	34	35	19	41	50		
AMI	42	36		25	36						
ASN	68	57	27	72	61		82	83	95		
BLK	27	33	27	27	22	28	33	65	59		
HSP	34	40	32	40	34	25	40	52	78		
MUL	55	55		55	42	42	64	75	81		
WHT	45	42	32	57	44	42	64	79	90		
FRL	30	35	27	32	25	26	39	65	63		
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	18	46	46	28	51	46	28	58	77		

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
ELL	20	49	52	30	43	43	21	55	67		
ASN	58	73	58	74	60		75	80	71		
BLK	35	48	48	39	44	40	41	65	81		
HSP	41	51	53	47	46	38	42	68	79		
MUL	58	48	42	64	58	58	79	96	89		
WHT	59	57	53	63	58	43	68	84	84		
FRL	38	53	53	42	47	39	41	68	78		

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	19	37	31	28	42	37	20	55			
ELL	18	41	35	31	50	45	22				
ASN	71	61		75	68		90	100	90		
BLK	35	44	32	40	52	49	40	98	81		
HSP	37	46	42	42	52	52	34	97	89		
MUL	52	44		51	61	47	47	100	73		
WHT	56	52	37	66	63	55	67	94	84		
FRL	37	44	34	42	52	50	43	95	80		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	35
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	68
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	36
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	41
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	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	55
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA data, the LPQ math component across grade levels showed the lowest performance. With one teacher resigning and another teacher went on FMLA due to his wife medical issue, the students missed out on daily standard based instruction. Due to COVID-19, the state cancelled state assessments. The 2019-2020 math PMAs showed this component moving in the positive direction in double digits.

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

Civics showed the greatest need for improvement based off progress monitoring and 2019 assessment. The sub groups were ELLs, SWD, and FRL.

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

The reason for the decline was that only level 5s(85) students were placed in Civics the previous year which yielded a 96% proficiency, but left a lot of students needing Civics the following school year. The 2018-2019 school year yielded (385) students with (115) students with a lexile under 600. The Social Studies progression was a contributing factors because students were placed in Civics, but did not exhibit the readiness for Civics. Scheduling students appropriately allowed for a natural progression of learning and growth.

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

LPQ Reading component showed the most improvement.

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

The lack of standards based instruction along with standard aligned tasks/activities to drive mastery of standards taught. We used the Reading Coach to support teachers with standard based instruction. Also, we used the Reading Coach as an Interventionist to work with LPQ students who were ten points away from the next proficiency bucket. The Region Specialist also worked with students in small groups who hadn't mastered already taught highly assessed standards. This practice continued during the 2019-2020 school year with buy out planning periods instead of the Reading Coach.

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

Teaching strategies that meet the needs of all students using visual, auditory, and kinesthetic best practices for all learners. Model as you teach, integrate technology into the lesson, provide opportunity for authentic discourse and student engagement, and use of manipulative to stimulate learning.

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.

The professional development opportunities to support teachers will be with the learning arc. PD on how to create standard aligned activities and tasks to provide students the opportunity to authentically engage with the standard taught and experience to expose the misconceptions of the standard. PD on how to create extension lessons to provide opportunities of learning the multiple ways a standard can be assessed.

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

Continual PD on improving the instructional craft as it aligns with standards based instruction. Utilization of standards aligned resources to compliment the effective teaching. The use of progress monitoring tool as an active part of the data decision process to create individualized learning plans for all students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reflecting on our Standards Walk-through data, the Area of Focus remains student tasks and activities as it relates to standards based instruction. The data revealed that the instruction matched the information on the focus board and the materials used were aligned with the standards, but the students task alignment did not often coordinate with the standards which impacted the appropriate alignment to the learning arc of the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	By December 2021, we will close the gap between aligned materials and student task alignment from 12% to 6% on the learning arc because teachers will engage in a refresh in standards based instruction learning plans procedures.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by using the approved Standards Walk-through tool and informal observations with timely authentic feedback. Based on the Standards Walk-through Tool, our admin team can measure classrooms that have student task alignment that coordinates with the standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will continue to collaborate and engage in tiered professional learning opportunities involving unpacking standards to create aligned activities and tasks that are content grade level appropriate for where the teacher should be in the learning arc of the standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration and engaging in tiered professional learning opportunities will allow teachers the opportunity to work together on potential solutions to common barriers that are impacting student individual and collective achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with timed during planned faculty meetings and Common Planning to collaborate and engage in tiered professional learning opportunities for incorporating student use and understanding of the standards. Teachers will vet instructional materials to create student aligned task to support standard mastery. We will use the Standard Walk-through tool to calibrate and guide our discussion.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Provide teachers with the learning opportunity to participate in Common Planning sessions with administration and Gifted Lead teacher to brainstorm solutions to common barriers, to utilized standard aligned activities and tasks to create aligned FSA equivalent experience assessments using the Item Spec rationale and standards. We will use the Standard Walk-through tool to guide our discussion.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Focus Walks opportunities will be created by Admin to allow time for teachers to observe best practices of the targeted focus. We will use the Standard Walk-through tool to guide our calibration.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Admin completing Standard Walk-through to ensure we have shared common definitions, evidence, and expectations across all grade level and contents will yield to evidence that our content teams consistently plan standards based instruction with aligned tasks and assessments. Admin will complete at least 2 walks together a day to ensure calibration is strong.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	High standards for teaching and learning are the result of a strong leadership team that functions as an active and skilled group. Due to decline on the 2020-2021 school year survey, Instructional Leadership has been identified as the Area of Focus.
Measurable Outcome:	Instructional leadership will shift from neutral to green on the 2021-2022 UChicago survey.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by the teacher leaders taking the lead on the standards based instruction work to accelerate learning from the teacher to the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide opportunities for department chairs to increase and build their own leadership capacity with the standards based instruction work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Instructional Leadership Team is stronger when more personnel are actively engaged in the observations and feedback process. Department chairs will be better prepared to provide feedback that reflects the one common voice that is aligned with standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Leadership Team will meet on a monthly basis to review current academic and discipline data, SIP goals, and new barriers.

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Instructional Leadership Team will review feedback from Standards Walk-through observations to help share the work in content PLCs

Person Responsible	Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Instructional Leads to support and guide department chairs in leading PLC with their content area by using the feedback from the Standards Walk-through observations with teacher lesson/student work

Person Responsible	Sharonette Shaw (shaws@duvalschools.org)

Department Chairs will work alongside the Instructional Lead to develop the agenda for content area PLC based on the feed back from the Standards Walk-through observations.

Person Responsible	Daniel Copeland (copelandd@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic growth is higher when students feel safe both in and around the school building and when they travel to and from home. Due to a low score, but an increase from the previous year, School Safety has been identified as the Area of Focus.
Measurable Outcome:	School Safety will increase from poor to neutral on the 2021-2022 UChicago Survey.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by providing students opportunities to share feedback and generate ideas on ways we can make the campus feel safe.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Daniel Copeland (copelandd@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide students with information regarding emergency procedures on a daily basis. Reduce the number of students in the restroom and continue with the directional one way transitions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Verbally preparing students for an emergency situation to help them to recall action steps in case of an actual emergency. Limiting the number of students in the hallways and restrooms will also make the environment less overwhelming and easier to supervise for teachers in the hallways. Posting GFS in specific locations to remind students of the expected behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

Incorporate ERT protocol in the morning announcements

Person Responsible	Daniel Copeland (copelandd@duvalschools.org)

Signage posted pertaining to Guidelines for Success. Restrooms will be monitored during transition by teachers and during instructional time by security guards.

Person Responsible	Daniel Copeland (copelandd@duvalschools.org)

Grade levels will have staggered transition and one directional movement. Quarterly Code of Conduct assemblies and monthly fire and active shooter drills.

Person Responsible	Daniel Copeland (copelandd@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.

Becoming a school with a strong culture focus on standards based instruction, this will help us to identify, progress monitor, and incorporate targeted interventions to address the academic and social needs of students who are showing signs based on the Early Warning Indicators. As we are making this shift, it will allow us to identify students early. We can incorporate the academic and social interventions to meet the needs of the students earlier. This should decrease the number of students who exhibit Early Warning indicators.

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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that 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. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholders is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

To build a more culturally sensitive environment for all stakeholders. Twin Lakes will continue with effective and consistence communicate between school and home using our various communication vehicles in English and Spanish (when available). Parents will be encouraged to attend and join the only decision making bodies (SAC and PTSA). After events, we will have surveys to gather parents feedback. We will increase student engagement and presence by increasing opportunities for students to have a voice in how the learn. Encourage teachers to build a solid relationship with students and parents. We will continue with the Wolves Den and TLAM bucks as incentive for positive behavior. For teachers, we will continue to provide professional development on creating a culturally sensitive learning environment. We will also continue to build capacity in our teacher leaders and providing opportunities for others to lead and share their craft with others. Admin will continue to celebrate and serve our teachers monthly to show our appreciation.