

Duval County Public Schools

Anchor Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Anchor Academy

555 WONDERWOOD DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Beale

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Anchor Academy

555 WONDERWOOD DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>14%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>55%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a positive, safe learning environment and educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared to be successful in college, career, and in life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Beale-Collier, Jennifer	Principal	<p>Jennifer Beale-Collier: provides leadership that motivates instructional and support personnel to strive for and provide the best possible opportunities for student growth and development both socially and emotionally. As the principal, she creates and maintains a safe, inviting environment for all students. Conducts faculty and staff evaluations to provide improvement to their professional practices. Continues to ensure a positive behavioral system that is fair and promotes restorative justice is provided to all students. Supports teachers' understanding and implementation of the Florida State Standards which strategically correlate to students being College and Career ready. Evaluates the social, emotional, and educational needs of all students in the building based on current behavior data, then problem solves. Facilitates professional development and provides opportunities for staff and faculty. This professional development will be focused on developing the understanding and implementation of the Learning Arc, Ready Reading, Duval Math, Science, and the Florida Standards for all content areas. Develops, articulates, and uses a shared vision of instructional excellence to guide and define school-based decisions. Consistently communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based decisions via parent-link, SAC, PTA, and social media.</p>
Coffman, Carly	Assistant Principal	<p>Carly Coffman is responsible for Instructional Levers and student discipline; serves as the Testing Coordinator and Instructional Materials Manager; monitors instruction with regularly scheduled walkthroughs and using the informal and formal components of the district's CAST system; serves as a consultant for the School Advisory Council.</p>
Keith, Eliese	School Counselor	<p>serves as the school's Guidance Counselor; provides classroom guidance, small group instruction, and behavior support for struggling students; oversees the MRT and Rtl meetings; monitors instructional support for ESE and ELL students using the district's FOCUS program</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/27/2021, Jennifer Beale

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

313

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

1

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

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	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	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	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	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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	53	61	71	53	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	12	27	26	13	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	24	39	42	24	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149

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	14	28	22	12	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	53	61	71	53	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	12	27	26	13	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	24	39	42	24	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149

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	14	28	22	12	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				66%	50%	57%	69%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	58%	55%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	50%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	62%	63%	71%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	63%	62%	60%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	52%	51%	27%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				66%	48%	53%	64%	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	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	69%	50%	19%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
		-74%				
		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	64%	8%	64%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	49%	22%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kg - 2nd: Fall, Winter, and Spring I-Ready Diagnostics in reading and math, teacher assessments
 3rd - 5th: District Baselines, i-Ready Diagnostics, PMA's, Freckle - Star Assessments, teacher assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	53	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	37	58
	Students With Disabilities	46	52	67
	English Language Learners	13	24	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	56	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	60	67
	Students With Disabilities	41	53	60
	English Language Learners	23	35	54

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	66	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	54	63
	Students With Disabilities	53	58	65
	English Language Learners	45	49	56
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	61	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	56	66
	Students With Disabilities	43	55	61
	English Language Learners	32	44	60
	Grade 3			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51	58	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	55	64
	Students With Disabilities	44	59	60
	English Language Learners	25	36	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	51	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	62	67
	Students With Disabilities	59	62	68
	English Language Learners	34	41	56

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56	63	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	54	66
	Students With Disabilities	43	51	67
	English Language Learners	25	34	51
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	52	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	55	68
	Students With Disabilities	41	47	58
	English Language Learners	32	47	52
	Grade 5			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	57	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	56	64
	Students With Disabilities	41	51	65
	English Language Learners	34	45	56
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	60	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	56	68
	Students With Disabilities	43	48	57
	English Language Learners	32	40	55
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	52	63	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	52	67
	Students With Disabilities	54	61	66
	English Language Learners	32	46	52

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	63			50							
BLK	73			46							
HSP	58			58							
MUL	57			71							
WHT	66	60		66	50		67				
FRL	43			39							
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	16	31	30	32	31	30	31				
BLK	67	61		70	67						
HSP	57	62		83	77						
MUL	50			64							
WHT	72	60	40	75	68	40	65				
FRL	60	39		67	65		56				
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	48	50		36	35	10	45				
BLK	55	41		73	53						
HSP	81	58		76	67						
MUL	87			67							
WHT	67	54	20	68	60	23	78				
FRL	60	43	21	65	50	15	50				

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	64
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	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97%

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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
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	
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	62
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	41
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?

The data component which showed the lowest performance was our Students with Disabilities. One major contributing factor is that due to our large transient military student population our students who come from out of state, and out of the country do not stay with us from year to year. Thus their knowledge isn't maintained, and their scores often don't get counted.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our FRL Population. The factors that contributed to this decline were inconsistent reading intervention, lack of transportation prevented students from receiving academic support.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was our Students with Disabilities Population in the area of Reading Achievement. The state was 26%, and our SWD was 16%. The factor that contributed to this gap was due to our large transitional military student population, our students who come from out of state, and out of the country do not stay with us from year to year. Thus their knowledge isn't maintained, and their scores often don't get counted.

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

Math 65% was the data component that showed the most improvement in all areas versus the District, and State data.

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

This improvement can be attributed to our math teacher's consistent use of data-driven, differentiated small group instruction which was based on individual student needs.

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

Continued use of differentiated small group instruction. Consistent and continued use of the Learning Arc Protocol when developing and implementing unit lesson plans.

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.

Learning Arc Framework, Freckle, Achieve 3000, B.E.S.T. Standards Instruction.

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

We've received funding for a Standards Coach, and plan to use this position as an interventionist who will focus solely on supporting our LPQ and bubble students in the areas of reading and math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Standards aligned instruction is identified as a critical need because historically, many students are performing below grade level in Mathematics. According to the Spring 20-21 iReady Diagnostic data, 48% of students in grades K-4 are underperforming by at least one grade level. 47% of these students were also performing below the 50th percentile according to iReady Math. Math was the lowest performing area in our FSA data, at 62% proficiency and 50% gains. This is compared to Reading where 65% were proficient and 68% of the same students made gains. 72% percent of these students were proficient in Science. This discrepancy shows that when students were presented with standards aligned instruction, they are successful; in turn, a lack of standards based instruction and remediation have a negative impact on student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

At least 60% of students in grades K, 1 and 2 will be performing on grade level by the Winter iReady Math Diagnostic. At least 65% of students in grades K, 1 and 2 will be performing on grade level by the Spring iReady Math Diagnostic. 70% of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 will score at least 70% on Math PMA 1. By PMA #2, 75% of students will score 70% or higher. By PMA #3, 80% of students will score 70% or higher.

Monitoring:

Weekly common planning sessions will be held every Thursday for 45 minutes. During this time the faculty will work with Mrs. Coffman and Mrs. Collier to plan for instruction using the learning arc. Once objectives and student tasks are designed, administrators will conduct regular classroom visits using the standards walkthrough tool. The walkthrough data will be shared with faculty and staff during common planning with a direct focus on student mastery of specific standards.

Anchor Instructional Leadership Team will meet monthly to review schoolwide data, including baseline, PMA and classroom assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

One evidence-based strategy being implemented for this are is to teach strategies- not just concepts. We will provide our students with multiple strategies so that they may discover which strategies allow the to be accurate and efficient. These strategies should be evident in lesson plans, on anchor charts and in student work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

After reviewing student work and anecdotal notes, it is clear while students have mastered skills (such as multiplication facts) many students still lack the strategies needed to problem solve. In addition, teachers are failing to provide artifacts for students to refer back to when reviewing and/or remediating their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide each teacher with a hard copy of the MAFS, including the item specifications and test design blue print summary.
2. Meet with teachers weekly to:
 - a. unpack standards and develop aligned objectives using the learning arc (plan to use the objectives for whole group instruction and small group remediation)
 - b. model and practice best practices for math instruction (including building conceptual understanding, creating anchor charts, effective use of student journals)
 - c. analyze student work
 - d. analyze and disaggregate student data
3. Plan for standards aligned instruction and assessment.

4. Perform classroom observations using the standards walk through tool.
5. Review walkthrough data with teachers and adjust planning practices accordingly.

Person Responsible Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Upon review of our Standards Walkthrough Dashboard data during the 2019-2020 school year, the lowest assessed category was Assessing Student Learning (specifically in the areas of "Determining Mastery" and "FSA Alignment." This information was also confirmed during our 2020-21 "Instructional Review," and although Instructional Standards are the key focus of the planning process, and the tasks and materials selected are to be aligned with what students are supposed to learn, the data shows that student tasks and assessment opportunities intended to show mastery of grade-level content doesn't always reflect the progression of the Learning Arc or FSA expectations as they relate to the targeted standard and/or state testing demands. School-wide implementation of the Learning Arc protocol, with a focus on supporting Content Area teachers in grades K-5 through regularly scheduled Professional Learning Communities, and Common Planning.

Measurable Outcome: If ninety percent of my Core Content teachers engage in ongoing Standards-Based Instructional planning, and fully implement the Learning Arc Protocol, then we will move from "weak/moderate" to "strong" on the SBI Continuum.

Monitoring: Administrative calibration and collaboration on the creation of Learning Arcs. Calibrate the use of the Standards-Based Walkthrough Tool to determine where my Assistant Principal and I are on the School Continuum, to ensure we move from weak to moderate to strong. 5.) Conduct weekly ADMCP meetings to allow for both PLCs and Common Planning. Here teachers, district specialists, and administrators will collaborate, plan and create standards-based lessons using the Learning Arc. Standards-aligned assessments will be developed, reviewed, and modified based on grade-level specific standards. 6.) Standards-based walkthroughs will occur weekly. The Principal and Assistant Principal will each conduct four classroom visits weekly then calibrate to see if their results align.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy being implemented throughout the building for this "Area of Focus" will be the utilization of the Learning Arc and School-Based Continuum via lesson plans, Formative and Informative Assessment Data, and ADMCP/Professional Learning Communities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to the Opportunity Myth, students who are able to work on grade-appropriate assignments and assessments have shown a significant increase in their academic achievement. Therefore, creating, implementing, assessing, and reflecting to determine the next steps for grade-level standards-based instruction is an important part of the process for our students to demonstrate mastery of the full standard, and become proficient.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to our 2020-21 5 Essentials Data while we increased in points Anecdotal notes, and parent interactions.85% of our students are military-connected. The average military family moves three times more often than their civilian counterparts. Repeated and extended separations and increased hazards of deployment increase stress in military children's lives. One-third of school-aged military children show psycho-social behaviors such as anxiety, worrying often, and crying more frequently. A positive school environment has been shown to impact academic performance and positively influence the emotions and behaviors of students.

Measurable Outcome: 5-Essentials Survey Data, decrease in the number of negative Dojo points.

Monitoring: The instructional leadership and PBIS teams, and Coffee with the Principal will allow me to monitor relationships and problem-solve.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The school counselor works with students both through classroom guidance, in small group and one on-one interactions. She is also involved in the behavior support aspect of the school discipline process. Additionally, since almost 90% of Finegan's students are from military families, the school has two Military and Family Life Counselors (MFLC) to address the unique challenges faced by those families. Sponsored by the Department of Defense, the program offers private and confidential nonmedical counseling to Service members' families, children, and staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small group counseling provides a safe setting where children, along with their peers can increase their self awareness and improve their cooperation and communication skills.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The primary area of concern for us was bullying and harassment. In order to develop a positive school culture and environment at AA, stakeholders will routinely be engaged in providing feedback at the school level and creating internal and external school improvement goals addressing this area of focus. During the 2019-2020 school year, faculty/staff, students, and parents were highly encouraged to complete the 5Essentials Survey. The nature of this survey provided them with an opportunity to express their feedback concerning various domains involved in the operation of the school confidentially. Teachers provided feedback related to the categories of Ambitious Instruction, Effective Leaders, Collaborative Teachers, and Involved Families. Students provided feedback related to the categories of Ambitious Instruction and Supportive Environment. Parents provided feedback related to the categories of Communication Preferences, Computer-Internet Access, Parent Connectedness, Parent Involvement & Disruptions, Parent Satisfaction, Parent-Student Interaction, Parent-Teacher Interaction, Parents' Assessment of Involvement in School, Parent's Assessment of School Safety, Parents' Assessment of Teacher Trust, Quality of School Facilities, and School Outreach.

When these data points are collected from the various stakeholder groups, review and analysis of this information will be conducted through multiple forums, including Coffee with the Principal, Shared Decision-Making, SAC, and PTA meetings, and a newly formed Leadership Team. This will enable stakeholders to interpret the meaning of the data results and determine the next steps for improvement associated with making the school culture and environment more positive moving forward.

During each school year, the SAC Committee meets at least 8 times per year on a monthly basis to engage stakeholders in the process of school improvement. One of the topics continually addressed is the school culture, so various representative groups are able to provide the administration with direct feedback and determine actionable next steps to improve in this area. Each year, the Principal holds monthly Coffee with the Principal with parents as a way to communicate with parents. Anchor Academy will hold Behavior Threat Assessment Team meetings on a monthly basis to review current behavioral data (i.e. number of referrals, the severity of violations).

In 2020-2021, the PBIS Committee created an annual PBIS Plan to guide how JFE faculty/staff members encourage and reinforce positive behaviors from all students. The Anchor Academy's newly formed Leadership Team will also actively promote positive school culture and learning environment by developing ways in which faculty/staff members can be recognized for their personal and professional achievements.

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.

1. Anchored 4 Life Club: Anchored 4 Life develops leadership skills, enhances life skills, builds confidence, reinforces team building, and offers support by: building positive connections, increasing self-esteem and positive self-worth, integrating empathy and integrity into daily activities, providing opportunities to support transitioning youth by giving kits and co-leading location tours and activities. Students are recognized weekly and monthly for displaying positive character traits.
2. Faculty and Staff Professional Development: Professional development scheduled for pre-planning with Sharon Kasica, School Liaison Officer for Naval Station Mayport. The PD focuses on highly effective strategies to support military students and their families, as well as create a school environment that is supportive of military children.
3. School Beautification: The school has established a partnership with PTA and several local business partners to make significant improvements to the school campus. The improvements include additional benches to play area, improvements to school atrium as well as the front of the campus.
4. Monthly Teacher Raffles, Teacher Recognition Events: Team building strategies will be used during monthly faculty meetings. A variety of prizes will be raffled off each month during the faculty meeting. Every teachers' birthday will be recognized with a card and small token.

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

Jennifer Collier- Principal
 Carly Coffman- Assistant Principal
 Dana Carpenter - SAC President
 Nicole Carter- PTA President
 Elise Keith - School Counselor

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$1,650.00