J. Allen Axson Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

http://www.duvalschools.org/jaa

Demographics

Principal: Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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)	28%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (70%) 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

J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

http://www.duvalschools.org/jaa

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	16%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

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.

To provide educational excellence to every student every day using the Montessori Method of instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life through the Montessori Method.

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
Robinson Vanhoy, Cecilia	Principal	To ensure that all teachers have the necessary materials and training to do their job. To ensure that each student is learning and performing at their maximum potential. Using the strength of each staff member to ensure that all students are learning and thriving educationally while at Axson.
Roberts, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Avera, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	4th & 5th Grade Team Leader
Loschiavo, Sara	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader Grade 1-3
Dubuisson, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead Pk3-K
Bryson, Irene	School Counselor	
Dubberly, Robyne	Teacher, ESE	
Budd, Tara	Other	Gifted Teacher
Queniat, Isabelle	Teacher, PreK	Primary Teacher Lead
Fitzharris, Adrienne	Instructional Coach	Working with Teacher and Admins to increase students proficiency in Reading
Nunley, Michelle	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Seng, Henry	SAC Member	SAC Co-Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2012, Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy

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.*
25

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
39

Total number of students enrolled at the school
589

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

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
Tuesday 7/27/2021

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	97	83	83	69	74	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	10	23	15	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	27	37	22	13	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	8	19	11	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	97	83	83	69	74	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	10	23	15	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	27	37	22	13	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	8	19	11	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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				85%	50%	57%	83%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				77%	56%	58%	67%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	50%	53%	62%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				84%	62%	63%	80%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				80%	63%	62%	66%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	52%	51%	47%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				81%	48%	53%	82%	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	90%	51%	39%	58%	32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
05	2021					
	2019	87%	50%	37%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	81%	49%	32%	53%	28%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

FSA 2021 Results:3rd,4th and 5th Grade.
K-2 ELA I-Ready
K-3 Math I-Ready
3rd-5th ELA Achieve
3rd,4th & 5th Math PMA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44%	79%	96%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37%	63%	85%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	47%	73%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	34%	56%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	56%	71%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	48%	83%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64%	87%	85%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43%	64%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68%	75%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55%	66%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	25%	62%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	72	58		64	63	62	50				
ASN	92			88							
BLK	68			68							
HSP	77			73							
MUL	80			75							
WHT	89	65		81	67		86				
FRL	68	50		63	42		58				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	58	62	57	61	75	61	53				
ASN	100			90							
BLK	64	47		83	78						
HSP	81	76		85	82		73				
MUL	84	79		79	71						
WHT	89	87	73	85	79	50	91				
FRL	66	62	64	76	85		53				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	50	50	46	50	47	36	54				
ASN	100	92		100	67						
BLK	63	58		77	53		73				
HSP	67	64		57	57						
MUL	79	52		79	61	50	80				
WHT	89	70	59	81	71	47	89				
FRL	70	60	71	64	55	44	53				

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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	90
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	68
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	75
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	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	78
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	56
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 had one of our lowest 5th grade groups this past year. In addition, we did not have 4th grade data as that group in 2020 did not get tested due to the COIVD 19 Pandemic. We also had five classrooms online with students all year. We also found that some of our neediest students were online which contributed to our score drops.

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

The greatest needs are Math Gains(-18 pt loss) and Bottom Quartile (-19 pt loss).

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

I think the pandemic and the variety of online and in the building learning fractured the learning process. In addition, we had students coming in the building and or online based on the rise in COVID cases during the pandemic.

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

2019 assessment we made growth. However, in 2021, we had a 63 point drop but maintained our "A" status.
We did maintain our ELA proficiency of 85 from 2019 to 2021.

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

There were not contributing factors to growth as we dropped from 2019-2021.

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

Teacher's, Instructional Coach and Administrators will need to really understand their quarterly assessment data to move students. Reviewing quarterly data each nine weeks should accelerate student learning as instructional goals are adjusted to support struggling students and accelerate 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.

We will have an Instructional Coach for the first time and feel that this will help facilitate teacher support. In addition, my Region has been broken up into Elementary 1 Principal Group and Elementary 2 Principal Group, this is allowing my regional bosses, Mrs. Simon and Mrs. Manabat to visit school regularly to support school leaders. I feel that this is going to be able to help Axson have more outside support and feedback to help us improve this school year.

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

We currently are piloting individual site licenses(46) for Read Naturally in one elementary classroom. We are then waiting on beginning of the year student assessment data for 1st-3rd Grade to see who the struggling learners are and who will be assigned additional support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: ELA Achievement Subgroup 2019. If the identified subgroups: SWD 58%, BLK 64% and FRL 66% increase to at least 70% Axson will increase its overall ELA achievement and close the learning gap.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase each identified subgroups by at least 5% or more to close the achievement gap.
Monitoring:	Principal, Assistant Principal and Instructional Coach will meet regularly to analyze student performance to see how we can continue to increase individual student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use Leveled Literacy Intervention(LLI) three times a week for identified subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This is an evidence based strategy that DCPS uses in Title 1 school to increase literacy. This has a proven track record of success and has the potential to increase Axson sub group scores by 5% or more.

Action Steps to Implement

The subgroups listed above will be given additional instruction using the LLI Kit to increase each subgroups overall growth by 5% or more. In addition, Using instructional dollars to fund a part-time reading interventionist.

Person Responsible	Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using the Standards-Based Continuum Tool, New Benchmarks(K-2) and Axson PLC work from 2019-2020 we will work on category 3. Standards-based Planning and 4. Aligned Observation. The goal is to work on the continuum to achieve good to strong in the categories listed. Admins will be working with an instructional coach to support and facility these sessions.
Measurable Outcome:	Administrators will see growth on Assessing Student Learning(work on learning ARC) and moving from 4.1 to 4.4 on the SBW Tool by Mid-Year 2022.
Monitoring:	Admins and Coach will work together during our regular meetings to assess expectations from monthly district coaches meetings and input from teachers in the groups to determine progress and next steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Quality instructional delivery aligned to grade level standards gives students the opportunity to participate in grade level standards gives students the opportunity to participate in grade level appropriate tasks(BEST, Standards Based Instruction with Montessori Materials), assessments and prepare them for promotion.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In the Opportunity Myth it states that students should be given grade appropriate, standards aligned tasks, assignments and assessments to ensure they are prepared for state assessments and grade level promotion.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly Common Planning: Mrs. Cecilia Vanhoy, Amy Roberts and Instructional Coach will share responsibilities to meet with PLC teams once a month to work on Assessing Student Learning on the Standards Walk-Through Tool. We will be using the Montessori Scope and Sequence for each grade level. Standards, Montessori works and district curriculum will be aligned for use in classrooms at all grade levels.
During Monthly Common Planning sessions, AP, Coach and Principal will collaborate on training from the district to implement during common planning or Early Dismissal.

Person Responsible	Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

2. Standards Based Walk Throughs: Regional Administrators, School Administrators and teacher will observe Student Aligned Tasks and Student Assessments within the classroom setting. Data will be reviewed once a month by admin team and best practices of colleagues and students will be shared in discussed in PLC.

Person Responsible	Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

3. Fidelity to Montessori Method/BEST & Standards Based Instruction: During work-cycle, students will be given individual work plans that include targeted, aligned and differentiated instruction. Teachers will pull small groups to remediate based on student needs. This will include multi-aged grade level groupings based on data(baseline, assessments, exit tickets, Achieve, I-ready and Freckle.

Person Responsible	Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@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.

Based on the information in the link we are ranked #1 in the state and are at the low end for incidents. We will continue to use our Montessori Grace and Courtesy lessons, Peace Rose, Community Meetings, SEL: Calm Classroom to train our students in appropriate social and emotional growth and continue to monitor any incidents that arise.

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.

Axson continues to monitor the elements of the 5Essentials by surveying: students, parents and staff for feedback each school year. We were recognized by our district for maintaining a well-organized environment for improvement. The goal will be to continue to look at Effective Leaders, Collaborative Teachers, Ambitious Instruction, Involved Families and a Supportive Environment.
In order to continue to maintain a well-organized school it takes the involvement of all stakeholders. Each member brings their unique perspective that continues to make our Montessori environment thrive. It is essential school leaders make opportunities for stakeholders to be heard and help create and drive this positive school culture.
From 2020-2021 students did not feel as safe in our school or online. We went from 99% to 72%. It was a 27% drop in how students completed the survey than in 2020. I do feel that COVID played apart in the feeling students had on the environments safety. The other drop was Student-Teacher Trust which was 94% to 88% which was a 6% drop. This could be attributed to student movement from online to in person instruction or in person to online instruction. This past school year we had much more student, teacher movement due to COVID.

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

The stakeholders are all district and school administrators working with Axson's, staff, parents and students. Each year we work with the stakeholders listed above to continue to maintain and work towards a stronger culture each school year. To do this the leaders of Axson are open and receptive to feedback and strive to do our best to listen and improve based on that feedback.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**