

Duval County Public Schools

R. V. Daniels Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

R. V. Daniels Elementary School

1951 W 15TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

Demographics

Principal: Johnny Bryant

Start Date for this Principal: 12/7/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2021-22 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

R. V. Daniels Elementary School

1951 W 15TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>93%</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>98%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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 implement gifted strategies to provide creative, analytical, and verbal learning experiences for students to explore their unique talents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every R.V.Daniels student will be inspired to unlock their unique potential in pursuit of life-long learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bryant, Johnny	Principal	
Weertz, Andrea	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 12/7/2020, Johnny Bryant

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

NA

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

NA

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Total number of students enrolled at the school

219

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

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	18	25	32	47	44	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	7	11	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	11	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	7	10	20	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	23	47	62	63	53	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	23	47	62	63	53	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	50%	56%				62%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						58%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						36%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	48%	50%				73%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	47%						60%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						37%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	59%	59%				74%	48%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	50%	51%	-1%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	74%	50%	24%	56%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	64%	-7%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2022					
	2019	90%	57%	33%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	73%	49%	24%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	38		17	15						
ASN	89	83		100	89		92				
BLK	45	55	50	42	37	39	26				
FRL	33	54	55	28	31	40	22				
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	8			17							

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
ASN	93	71		100	64		80				
BLK	41	21		45	24	7	24				
FRL	35	14		38	18	9	19				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	92	70		100	97		83				
BLK	50	50	32	63	43	25	63				
MUL	100	70		100	80						
FRL	44	47	32	60	37	23	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

When analyzing final assessment results in grades 3 through 5 in reading and math student proficiency were above 50% trending back up to comparable scores from 3 years ago.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on 2021-22 progress monitoring assessment data the greatest need for improvement is to improve in the areas of math gains and 5th grade 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?

During the 2021-22 school year we lost certified teachers in 4th grade math and 5th grade science towards the end of the 1st semester of school and had to fill those roles with permanent substitute teachers. Actions taken will be to hire certified personnel for the 2022-23 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement was in the area of reading gains at 61% an increase of 30 percentage points.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement was identifying students who still struggled to read on grade level and developed small reading pull out groups that met at least twice a week with reading coach and regional reading specialist.

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

Once again we will begin our 4-step process by the end of September by using student baseline assessments to identify students who are close to being proficient in the areas of reading, math, and science.

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.

Bi-weekly PLC, common planning, and monthly early dismissal professional development sessions with teachers and leadership team

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

The additional services that will be implemented this year is the addition of a standards coach to help assist with teacher planning and student intervention.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In the 2022-23 school year, a main area of focus will be to continue to ensure teacher instruction and student learning are aligned to the new BEST standards. Having focus will help us in reaching our reading and math goals that will be established for this year.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Administration will be utilizing walk through forms and instructional rounds to continue to track and identify teacher best instructional practices that are aligned to the benchmarks. Qualitative data will be collected and analyzed during PLC's that will help serve to further the collaborative conversation around instructional practices.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored by observation tools used by administrators. Plans for teachers to observe other grade level teacher in their use of whole group, small, and one-on-one instructional practices that are aligned to the benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

During our PLC's, common planning, and early dismissal PD's we want to look at the instructional practices and how teachers are utilizing them during instruction daily. Identify benchmarks covered and assessed throughout the year in our PLCs and making adjustments in our instructional practices.

- Whole group classroom explicit instruction
- Small group teacher led instruction
- One-on-One instruction (intervention)
- Research based interventions that are appropriate to the individual student's area of focus

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We want to be intentional on how students are engaging with the benchmarks and instructional materials that are on grade level, sot with that we need to make sure that our instructional practices are aligned with the appropriate grade level benchmarks. Due to the goal of increasing our proficiency percentages we want to be intentional on how we monitor standards based instruction and fill in the learning gaps for our students who continue to struggle in reading and math on grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Weekly classroom walk through observations

PLC collaborative session bi-weekly

Title I funds will be utilized to fund another classroom teacher to further promote student achievement.

Title I funds will be utilized to fund a Paraprofessional to help support students and teachers during standards based instruction lessons that will further promote student achievement.

Title I funds will be utilized to purchase laptop carts to promote the goal of student achievement to be used during standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 5 Essentials/Instructional Leadership

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Develop a set of high standards for teaching and student learning and implement best practices that will be monitored for student success in the area of Instructional Leadership in the 5-Essential Survey and increase by 30 or more points in this area. We want to focus on a reengagement of leadership expectations, setting the clear vision for teaching and learning and feedback for student learning. This will help in the goal of increasing the level of trust between teachers and the administration team throughout the year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Instructional Leadership in the 5-Essential Survey and increase by 30 or more points in this area.
 Feedback forms/surveys from PLC and common planning sessions will be completed to see what next steps on how leadership can further support student achievement.
 Classroom walk through

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

During PLCs and common planning there will be designated time for teachers to share with each other and leadership for goals and next steps for support. This will be conducted bi-weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Leadership will engage in grade level and subject area planning and professional development sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Leadership and teachers will be able to fully engage in the communication of student achievement and identifying resources that teachers will need continue to promote student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

During pre-planning discussing this area of the 5 Essential Survey and getting feedback from teachers on how this are can improve going forward and maintain a level of consistency of practice as well.
 During the school year teacher surveys after PLCs, common planning, and early dismissal PDs that pertains to how leadership will help support teacher instructional needs.

Person Responsible Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

During pre-planning discussing this area of the 5 Essential Survey and getting feedback from teachers on how this are can improve going forward and maintain a level of consistency of practice as well. During the school year teacher surveys after PLCs, common planning, and early dismissal PDs that pertains to how leadership will help support teacher instructional needs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on 2021-22 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.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on 2021-22 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.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

K-2 Data:

Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring at grade level or above y 3-4 percentage points. decrease number of below grade level students by 3-4 percentage points

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3-5 Data:

Increase percentage of 3-5 grade students scoring level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of below grade level students by 3-4 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bryant, Johnny, bryantj1@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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-progressmonitoringimproves-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.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

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.

Bryant, Johnny,
bryantj1@duvalschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

This year we are seeking more opportunities to engage with our families and community stakeholders to continue to allow them access into our daily school experience. Through our Parent and Families Engagement activities throughout the year we hope to re-establish the connection between home and school relationships and provide accurate information as it relates to student learning and achievement.

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

School Advisory Council
PSTA
DCPS School Choice Office
Faith Based Partners