

Duval County Public Schools

Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

Demographics

Principal: Cassandra Delay N

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (63%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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.

Sheffield Elementary School's mission is to provide educational excellence at our school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.:

Sheffield Elementary School's vision is a community working together to inspire and prepare all students for success in college or a career and in life

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
DeLay, Cassandra	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Cary, Kimberly	Teacher, ESE	Liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level which includes feedback to the Leadership Team, presentations to the faculty, work with school-based coaches, and work with small collaborative groups of teachers, and provide direct intervention services and support to students identified as needing Tier II or Tier III intervention services. Leads MRT meetings at the school level. Assists to oversee and ensure compliance with the IEP process, FBA process and other ESE related services at the school level.
Williams, Erika	Assistant Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Small, Jason	Instructional Coach	Provides K-5 math plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention. Provides assistance to teachers through modeling and implementation of CORE Math lessons, Blended Learning, and math centers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Cassandra Delay N

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.*

5

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

635

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.

3

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	110	116	129	140	110	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722
Attendance below 90 percent	4	42	38	39	21	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	5	5	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	7	41	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	5	7	27	35	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	5	3	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/25/2022

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	110	132	105	114	109	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	25	28	21	21	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	4	8	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	3	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	56	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	23	26	21	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	13	44	24	19	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	4	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	110	132	105	114	109	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	25	28	21	21	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	4	8	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	3	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	56	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	23	26	21	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	13	44	24	19	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	4	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	58%	50%	56%				62%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						60%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						52%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	68%	48%	50%				68%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	73%						63%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						45%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	59%	59%				67%	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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	50%	8%	56%	2%
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	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	64%	9%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	64%	49%	15%	53%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	29	47	42	38	56	48	48				
ELL	45			55							
BLK	53	62	63	61	74	65	65				
HSP	46	67		64	78						
MUL	39	50		50	60						
WHT	63	62	45	74	71	47	71				
FRL	43	56	60	57	69	52	55				
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	26	45	38	40	65	65	26				
ELL	73			82							
BLK	55	64		61	68		55				
HSP	52			59							
MUL	71			62							
WHT	61	60	33	69	69	63	61				
FRL	47	52	45	54	67	53	49				
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	28	37	45	40	53	41	37				
ELL											
BLK	51	48	29	58	59	44	56				
HSP	71	78		77	74						
MUL	70	73		81	73						
WHT	65	63	60	71	62	37	72				
FRL	53	57	47	51	57	44	58				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

ESSA Federal Index	
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	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	63
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	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	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?

For the 2021-2022 school year Louis Sheffield Elementary saw an increase in proficiency in both Math and Science and a decrease in ELA proficiency. Our learning gains and LPQ gains increased from the 2020-2021 school year. ELA and Math learning gains increased above levels from 2019 where Our 4th grade cohort scored exceptionally well in math and our 3rd grade cohort did well in ELA.

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

Based off the current data, our greatest need for improvement is ELA. For the past 2 years, ELA achievement has dropped. In 2019 LSE had 62% proficient in ELA dropping to 61% in 2021 and 58% in 2022.

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 2019 and 2020 school years many of our students experienced virtual learning. During this time, the primary focus for students was ELA and math. Many of our students have gaps in their learning

from this time. Our actions for improvement are to prioritize ELA instruction in all grade levels and increase small group learning based on individual needs.

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

From 2021, our ELA gains increased 12 percent and our math gains increased 11 percent.

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

In both of these areas we had targeted, intentional groups of students who received intensive interventions. In ELA our 3rd grade students reading below grade level took part tutoring for 45 minutes with a certificated teacher. In math, admin and our math coach identified students who were not making adequate progress based on our district and school progress monitoring assessments. These students were provided additional tutoring during the school day.

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

We will continue in-school tutoring for ELA with our 3rd grade students who come in below grade level. In addition, we will continue school data chats and progress monitoring to identify students not making adequate progress throughout the year. We will offer in-school tutoring to help with closing learning gaps.

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.

All school staff will be trained on the new standards and new curriculum for math (K-5) and ELA (3-5) this year. In addition, school based support personnel (admin, interventionist, lead teachers) will provide coaching support and planning support throughout the year. New teachers will be provided additional support in the form of a cohort for bimonthly meetings and a mentor. Our school also has Surf Camp which are PD sessions facilitated by the leadership team and lead teachers on topics of interest throughout the year.

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

In addition to the focus on our intermediate students, we will have two paraprofessionals working directly with our K-2 students to receive interventions phonics and SEL as needed. We will continue with in-school tutoring and data chats for all students to progress monitor student growth throughout the year.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards

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

Teachers will need time to learn, practice and align classroom instruction and student assessment to the new standards (BEST.) This year all of our teachers will have new curriculum in math and our 3rd-5th grade teachers will also have a new reading curriculum in addition to new standards. Through this focus, teachers will work together with school and district leadership to receive training and collaborate on elements of effective teaching methods to achieve student success.

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

100% of LSE K-5 teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction, development and implementation of BEST Standards during administrative led common planning ensuring student tasks are aligned to the full rigor and depth of the standard. Through this work, the student task alignment on the SWT dashboard should be at least 80%.

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

Professional development will be done with teachers focused on implementation of BEST standards into their instruction and student assessment. Weekly common planning will take place with all ELA and math teachers in K-5 to provide necessary PD, plan for aligned instruction, and learning tasks. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

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

We will use the Standards Walkthrough Tool in addition to informal class observations to measure classroom instruction, student task alignment and assessment alignment in core classes

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

Use of the SWT will provide us with specific data points in order to assess which grade levels need additional support in implementation of the new standards.

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.

Utilize resources and reports from standards walk-through tool dashboard. Calibrate with APs and continue to use and share data frequently to ensure staff understanding and readiness. APs and principal will meet weekly and engage in conversation focused on evidence from the SWT and classroom observations to continue calibration throughout the year and discuss next steps.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

Frequent classroom walk-throughs by principal and AP using SWT to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

Quarterly teacher data chats with administration will focus on student growth through the implementation of the BEST Standards, aligned student tasks and aligned assessments. We will reflect on implementation in the classroom through focused evidence from walk-through data as well as student growth as shown through informal and formal data sets.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

Engagement of all K-5 teachers in professional development based around BEST standards-based instruction, implementation of aligned curriculum and creation of aligned materials.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

Leadership will engage in weekly common planning with all K-5 teachers in the areas of ELA and/or math to create materials aligned to current standards, create aligned student tasks and assessments and plan for instructional delivery in all classrooms.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

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

From the 5 Essentials survey, collective responsibility was the lowest measure in the collaborative teachers domain. Collective responsibility scored at 13 and increased 10 from the previous year.

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

If instructional leadership increased in the building then the Collaborative Teachers domain (specifically the collaborative teachers measure) will increase on the 2023 survey.

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

Classroom walkthroughs, common planning attendance and effectiveness, informal observation and school culture will be monitored to determine movement toward the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

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

Schools with higher culture and climate ratings tend to work efficiently to solve problems that may arise in the school including how to best serve students and families and how to support each other professionally through modeling of excellent instruction.

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

If the school is able to have a solid teacher to teacher trust and climate where teacher collaboration is the expectation, we will more consistently be able to support each other and students.

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.

Develop a plan for team building activities.

Person Responsible

Erika Williams
(williamse8@duvalschools.org)

Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate with one another in non-threatening environments. Implement Surf Camp (led by the leadership team and teachers) to allow teachers opportunities to share ideas and resources that are having a positive impact on standards based instruction and student growth within their classrooms.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

Provide opportunities for relationship building and professional discourse regularly within the school (common planning.)

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay
(delayc@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

In 2019, Louis Sheffield ELA achievement was 62%. This decreased to 61% in 2021 and 58% in 2022. Since COVID, many of our students have experienced virtual learning. Due to this, ELA gaps have increased.

Measurable Outcome:

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

On the FAST 5th ELA assessment, students will increase achievement to 62%.

Monitoring:

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

Data chats will be held with all classroom teachers to include a focus on ELA data (including PMA assessments, benchmark assessments and classroom assessments.) Schedules will be made by the leadership team to reflect daily science instruction in all grade levels with a focus from admin on monitoring the fidelity of this.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

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

Data chats will be held with all classroom teachers to include a focus on ELA data (including PMA assessments, benchmark assessments and classroom assessments.) Schedules will be made by the leadership team to reflect daily science instruction in all grade levels with a focus from admin on monitoring the fidelity of this.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Through progress monitoring admin will be able to determine progress and put interventions in place as needed throughout the year to ensure student growth in the area of ELA.

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.

Conduct quarterly data chats with ELA teachers to review students progress, monitor interventions and track student progress toward proficiency.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

Provide regular feedback through classroom walkthroughs to teachers to ensure effective instructional delivery.

Person Responsible

Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

Provide in-school tutoring for students who are not meeting proficiency and/or not making adequate progress in ELA.

Person Responsible

Erika Williams (williamse8@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.

It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, positivity and responsibility. We will do this by partnering with PTA to provide opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through certain events such as Family Movie Nights, Family Dances, Math Night, Literacy Night, Student Conference night etc.. These events will also involve other stakeholders such as business partners as well as our faith-based partners. Internally, administration works with our hospitality committee to promote a positive culture and climate for staff through monthly team-building and culture-building activities.

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

At Louis Sheffield, we have numerous stakeholder groups that contribute to promoting a positive culture and environment including PTA, SAC, faith-based partners, business partners, students and faculty/staff. Our staff are engaged in a Sunshine Committee to help promote positive culture and togetherness on campus. Our PTA and SAC work closely with school teachers and administration to promote, host and support parent events. Many of our business and faith based partners support student initiatives in the school such as Student of the Month to help us to recognize and celebrate student success.