

Duval County Public Schools

Highlands Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Highlands Elementary School

1000 DEPAUL DR, Jacksonville, FL 32218

<http://www.duvalschools.org/highlands>

Demographics

Principal: Natalya Richie

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (32%) 2016-17: C (41%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Highlands Elementary School

1000 DEPAUL DR, Jacksonville, FL 32218

<http://www.duvalschools.org/highlands>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">94%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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 in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and 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
Richie, Natalya	Principal	
Rowan-Thomas, Regina	Assistant Principal	
Fleming, LaTonya	School Counselor	
Coots, Sue	Reading Coach	
Thompkins, Sheila	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/28/2021, Natalya Richie

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.*

0

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

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

391

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

6

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

6

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	51	52	76	65	43	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
Attendance below 90 percent	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
Course failure in ELA	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
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	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
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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

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	5	8	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/28/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	78	62	62	75	72	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	417
Attendance below 90 percent	30	15	32	31	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	5	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	2	2	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	39	53	50	49	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	78	62	62	75	72	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	417
Attendance below 90 percent	30	15	32	31	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	5	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	2	2	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	39	53	50	49	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				24%	50%	57%	29%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	56%	58%	37%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	50%	53%	26%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	62%	63%	35%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	63%	62%	40%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	52%	51%	25%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				28%	48%	53%	31%	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	20%	51%	-31%	58%	-38%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	20%	52%	-32%	58%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2021					
	2019	24%	50%	-26%	56%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	64%	-26%	64%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	22%	49%	-27%	53%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

District PMA
I-Ready K-2

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	17	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	14	13
	Students With Disabilities	13	15	8
	English Language Learners	20	17	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	20	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	15	20
	Students With Disabilities	16	31	39
	English Language Learners	40	17	20

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	34	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	35	33
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	9
	English Language Learners	33	33	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50	37	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	31	30
	Students With Disabilities	18	25	18
	English Language Learners	100	33	67
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	21	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	22	30
	Students With Disabilities	9	20	22
	English Language Learners	29	14	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	22	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	26	32
	Students With Disabilities	9	20	33
	English Language Learners	29	14	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	16	20	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	20	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	11
	English Language Learners	14	14	14

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	30	42		39	50		31				
ELL	31			38							
BLK	25	41	36	29	41	40	12				
HSP	47			44			30				
MUL	35	23		53	23		23				
FRL	27	38	46	33	39	45	16				
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	27	52		49	71	91					
ELL											
BLK	21	44	60	40	62	63	29				
HSP	13			47							
WHT	33	64		67	71						
FRL	21	43	65	45	65	63	29				
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	27	27	20	24	32	33	23				
BLK	27	33	29	33	37	26	22				
HSP	27			53							
WHT	39	80		44	60						
FRL	27	37	26	34	39	24	30				

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	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	247
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	35
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	
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	32
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	31
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
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?

Decline in Science Proficiency each year 18-19 decrease 3 percentage points and 19-21 decrease 10 percentage points

Decline in Math Proficiency from 18-19 0 20-21 decrease of 10 percentage points

Decline in ELA BQ/Math BQ from 18-19 to 20-21 decrease of +15 percentage points

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

Greatest need for improvement according to FSA trends and PMA data:

1. Math proficiency, learning gains, BQ gains
2. ELA learning Gains, BQ gains
3. Science proficiency

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

Covid slide

Covid impacts to school - shutting down classrooms, excessive absences due to illness/projected illnesses

Face to Face Truancy

Virtual Learning Truancy

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

1. ELA proficiency increase 5 Percentage point 24% - 29%

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

Implemented tier 2 interventions corrective reading and reading mastery programs with fidelity

Lesson Arc/standards based planning and instruction

Celebrated students progress

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

1. Targeted PD for all teachers
2. Continue use of Tier Reading and Math programs with fidelity
3. Continuous monitoring of best practice and standards based planning instruction
4. Incentives for progress in all academic areas including attendance

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.

1. Standards Based Planning and instruction
2. VE/Teacher collaboration
3. Data Analysis
4. Corrective Reading/Reading Mastery Implementation
5. Best practices, teaching strategies for accelerating growth in lowest 25% percentile

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

1. Reading/Math Interventionist push ins
2. Assigned tutors to students who made a level 1 on FSA ELA assessment
3. After school tutoring for math and reading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Highlands Elementary ELA teachers inconsistently deliver instruction that is aligned to grade level standards due to conversations about the standard being surface level during Common Planning. Teachers understand how to create student task that align to the grade level standard but struggle with scaffolding for students that are not proficient readers. As a result, less than 25% of Highlands Elementary students scored a level 3 or higher on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment. Additionally, less than 45% of students made learning gains in Reading.

Measurable Outcome:

During 90% of administrative standards focus walks 100% of Highlands Elementary ELA teachers will demonstrate that they are meeting or exceeding expectations in the areas of Planning and Delivering Standards Based Instruction on the Standards Based Observation Tool. Progress monitoring through Standards Mastery Assessments will be used to reflect monthly if changes in planing and instructional delivery is impacting student proficiency in ELA. Ultimately, this change in planning practices will result in Highlands Elementary students' Reading proficiency to 35% (+10) and learning gains to 60% (+16) in 2021 on the Florida Standards Assessment.

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalya Richie (richien1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Intensive Coaching Cycles: Leadership Team members will conduct Focus Walks using the Standards Based Walk Through form then calibrate. Following the calibration, teachers will be tiered to determine needs for resources and support. Additional planning support will be provided for Tier 3 and Tier 2 teachers. Coaching cycles will be implemented by the Reading and Math Coach to provide support with lesson planning and implementation beyond Common Planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The cycle enhances the opportunity for teachers to co-plan, coteach, and then debrief with the administration and the Reading Coach so to improve knowledge of grade level standards and best instructional practices . Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers would benefit from more intense support.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on 2020-21 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 72%, 4th grade is 75%, and 5th grade is 75%.

o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%

Measurable Outcome:

K-5 data:

*Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

*Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalya Richie (richien1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-intobig-wins>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progressmonitoring-improves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. <https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies/>

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

Person Responsible Natalya Richie (richien1@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

Person Responsible Natalya Richie (richien1@duvalschools.org)

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership, district content specialists, and district leadership.

Person Responsible Natalya Richie (richien1@duvalschools.org)

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.

Professional Development-Teachers will engage in the Daring Classrooms professional development opportunity myths hosted by ViDL. Building on the shared belief surrounding leadership development, equity, safety and support Daring Classrooms professional development will inspire teachers to embrace the skills and attitudes that are common to develop a culture of collaborative and strategic instructional strategies and leadership skills at Highlands Elementary. After School and Before school Tutoring- All students in grades 3-5 will be invited to participate in Saturday School. Title I Funds will be used to purchase supplies for After School and before school tutoring. Additional tutoring will be provided during the school day to support students that are a level 1 in Reading or Math.

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.

Highlands Elementary involves parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review, and improvement of or school by holding regularly scheduled monthly SAC meetings and workshops. All parents are invited to attend the meetings and workshops. Meetings and workshops are announced via school website, newsletter, marquee, and School Messenger automated phone system. SAC has an important role of helping to develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and the Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). Input from parents will be documented via surveys, sign-in sheets, notes and minutes of meetings. Parents will be able to view the completed plan via the school website. A copy will be available for viewing in the Main Office. Individual hard copies will be available upon request.

As the neighborhood school for the Highlands community on the Northside of Jacksonville, we play an active role in the surrounding community and work to build partnerships with faith-based entities as well as local businesses. We have a renewed focus on getting parents and community members to serve as volunteers for the school and the students. These volunteers help in and out of the classroom as well as help to host events such as holiday celebrations. The new administration at the school has also worked hard this summer to visit local businesses to build relationships and support for the school. By doing so, we have been fortunate to have local companies who are willing to support some of our

initiatives, including the purchase of school supplies, rewards, etc. This will be a continued area of focus for the school so that we are able to secure resources for student achievement.

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

Setting the daily tone and model best professional practices, communicate, implement, monitor, and carry out collective mission and vision
 Principal - Natalya Richie-Graham
 Assistant Principal - Regina Rowan-Thomas
 Providing Highly Effective Customer Service Practices
 Data Entry Clerk Latoria Vereen
 Bookkeeper - Veranda Teal

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				\$210,915.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0991 - Highlands Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$68,700.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach will provide targeted support to teachers for the purpose of planning and facilitation of standards based instruction.</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0991 - Highlands Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$74,298.00
			<i>Notes: Math Coach will provide targeted support to teachers for the purpose of planning and facilitation of standards based instruction.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0991 - Highlands Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$67,917.00
			<i>Notes: Math Interventionist will provide targeted support to students whose FSA score was a Achievement level of 1 or 2 for the purpose of planning and facilitation of standards based instruction.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$210,915.00