

Duval County Public Schools

# Twin Lakes Academy Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Aurelia Williams**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Native American Students* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

### 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)
Middle School 6-8	No	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

### 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.**

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Provide every student, in every classroom, every day with a safe, caring, engaging and challenging learning environment that promotes the rigorous and relevant educational experiences necessary to perform at or above grade level standards.

### 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
Williams, Aurelia	Principal	Facilitate the leadership team meetings where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Copeland, Daniel	Assistant Principal	As the ELA and Social Studies Instructional Lead and AP of Curriculum, AP Copeland will assist with facilitating the leadership meetings where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Story, Godfrey	Dean	As the Dean, Mr. Story will review behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students postsecondary education.
Curry, Sequan	School Counselor	As the School Counselor and 504 Designee, Mr. Curry will review academic and behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact all students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students postsecondary education.
James, Francesca	School Counselor	As the School Counselor and ESOL Designee, Ms. James will review academic and behavior Tier 1 and Tier 2 data and evaluate how Tier 1 and Tier 2 services impact ESOL students. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares ESOL students postsecondary education.
Bryan, Molly	Teacher, ESE	As the FRVE, Ms. Bryan will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Bolden, Myra	Teacher, K-12	As the Math Department Chair, Ms. Bolden will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Madison, Felecia	Teacher, K-12	As the Social Studies Department Chair, Mrs. Madison will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.
Carter, Anoda	Instructional Technology	As the Technology Department Chair, Ms. Carter will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for postsecondary education.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 7/25/2022, Aurelia Williams

**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.*

0

**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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

60

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,147

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

1

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

15

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	325	337	362	0	0	0	0	1024
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	48	47	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	62	72	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	13	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	118	131	0	0	0	0	341
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	106	131	0	0	0	0	340
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	73	109	119	0	0	0	0	301

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	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	463	389	379	0	0	0	0	1231
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	68	55	0	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	81	48	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	13	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	13	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	293	173	73	0	0	0	0	539
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	245	271	239	0	0	0	0	755
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	210	0	125	0	0	0	570

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	8	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	12

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	463	389	379	0	0	0	0	1231
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	68	55	0	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	81	48	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	13	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	13	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	293	173	73	0	0	0	0	539
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	245	271	239	0	0	0	0	755
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	210	0	125	0	0	0	570

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	8	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	12

## 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	39%	43%	50%				48%	43%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						53%	49%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						50%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	44%	35%	36%				53%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%						51%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						42%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	48%	53%				57%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	53%	58%				76%	68%	72%

### 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
06	2022					
	2019	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2022					
	2019	54%	49%	5%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	37%	47%	-10%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	32%	32%	0%	46%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	40%	4%	48%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	67%	30%	67%	30%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	69%	3%	71%	1%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	79%	57%	22%	61%	18%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	61%	37%	57%	41%

### 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	9	26	25	13	35	38	12	38			
ELL	20	34	28	25	39	37	25	58	100		
AMI	36	55		27	73						
ASN	67	65		72	65		70	100	100		
BLK	26	37	33	31	44	45	33	59	84		
HSP	32	42	32	38	47	48	43	70	91		
MUL	48	44	45	50	52	43	65	75	93		
WHT	51	52	43	57	50	51	57	83	78		
FRL	30	39	29	34	47	50	38	60	80		
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	9	23	29	12	24	27	13	49			
ELL	18	36	31	23	34	35	19	41	50		
AMI	42	36		25	36						
ASN	68	57	27	72	61		82	83	95		
BLK	27	33	27	27	22	28	33	65	59		
HSP	34	40	32	40	34	25	40	52	78		
MUL	55	55		55	42	42	64	75	81		
WHT	45	42	32	57	44	42	64	79	90		
FRL	30	35	27	32	25	26	39	65	63		
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	18	46	46	28	51	46	28	58	77		
ELL	20	49	52	30	43	43	21	55	67		
ASN	58	73	58	74	60		75	80	71		
BLK	35	48	48	39	44	40	41	65	81		
HSP	41	51	53	47	46	38	42	68	79		
MUL	58	48	42	64	58	58	79	96	89		

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
WHT	59	57	53	63	58	43	68	84	84		
FRL	38	53	53	42	47	39	41	68	78		

### 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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	514
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	41
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	48
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	49
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	57
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	58
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	46
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?**



Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data, the LPQ in math and ELA across grade levels showed the lowest performance. The 2021-2022 PMA data showed these components moving in the positive direction in double digits for the SWD subgroup followed by the ELL subgroup in single digits. With starting the school year with (2) ELA vacancies in 7th grade, this grade level was projected to show the least gains with the one vacancy filled in November and the second one filled in January.

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

ELA (7th grade) showed the greatest need for improvement based off progress monitoring and 2022 FSA assessment. The sub groups were ELLs, SWD, and FRL.

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

The reason for the decline was starting the school year with (2) ELA vacancies in 7th grade, this grade level was projected to show the least gains with the one vacancy filled in November and the second one filled in January. Without consistency instruction from a certificated teacher to pull small groups to target the remediation standards. This grade level has remains a flat or low grade level to move in the gains and LPQ bucket. A Reading Interventionist has been hired to address the level 2s with a focus on 7th grade. This additional layer support with the continued ESE Support Facilitator assisting with small group instruction will help yield a high increase with the LPQ sub group.

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

Math overall showed the most improvement.

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

Creating standard aligned tasks/activities to drive mastery of standards taught. We used the ESE Support Facilitators to support teachers with standard based instruction and small group instruction to target highly assessed standards that weren't mastered; corrective instruction in the small group instruction. We focused on students who were ten points away from the next proficiency bucket and/or gain. We bought out planning periods for teachers to provide strategic tutoring during their planning periods to the targeted students. Tutoring was also offered before and afterschool.

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

Teaching strategies that meet the needs of all students using visual, auditory, and kinesthetic best practices for all learners. Model as you teach, integrate technology into the lesson, provide opportunity for authentic discourse and student engagement, and use of manipulative to stimulate learning.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

With a fairly new staff, the professional development opportunities to support teachers will be with how to strengthened their Tier 1 instruction utilizing the resources to provide procedural practice and how to plan for corrective instruction in small group to address the benchmarks not mastered based on the BEST standards. We will also provide PD on how to create standard aligned activities and tasks to provide students the opportunity to authentically engage with the standard taught and experience to expose the misconceptions of the standard. PD on how to create extension lessons to provide opportunities of learning the multiple ways a standard can be assessed.

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

Continual PD on improving the instructional craft as it aligns with standards based instruction. Utilization of standards aligned resources to compliment the effective teaching. The use of progress monitoring tool as an active part of the data decision process to create individualized learning plans for all students.

### **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 Math****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the Math data, we should have a laser focus approach on being strategic and intentional with how we address and meet the individual academic needs of our LPQ students. The data revealed that some of the students who should have made gains or proficiency based on previous data did not make gains or proficiency based on the 2022 FSA data.

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

If we implement standards based instruction with grade level aligned task/activity for procedural fluency and practice and progress monitoring with fidelity, then student achievement will increase for our LPQ students in math. We will use individualized prescriptions fully aligned with grade level expectations in math using PMA data and teacher developed common assessment for progress monitoring.

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

We will use PMA data and teacher developed common assessments to assist with monitoring and decision to shift in practice if needed to meet the math expectations

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

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

Allow time for teachers to collaborate and engage in collaborative planning opportunities involving analysis of student achievement data, the creation of individualized prescriptions with prescriptive strategies and the opportunity to unpacking standards to ensure the alignment of tasks and assessments are measuring the depth of standard.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Using the individualized prescriptions to progress monitor student achievement, teachers will consistently collect student achievement data to review and assess growth as determined by grade level cut scores. We will use PMA data and teacher developed common assessment for progress monitoring.

**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.

Providing teachers time during Common Planning and Early Release for professional development sessions to progress monitor and collaborate with peers in disaggregating student data, identifying prescriptive interventions and resources, and developing activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' instructional strengths based on student prescriptions.

**Person Responsible**

Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Provide teachers with the learning opportunity to participate in common planning sessions with administration and District Specialist to review data from current assessments and utilize data trackers to identify and progress monitor learning.

**Person Responsible** Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Model the process of creating and monitoring effective prescriptive sets and the use of resources such as Standard Protocol to ensure standard based instruction and aligned tasks and assessments are being used to measure the depth of standards.

**Person Responsible** Myra Bolden (boldenm@duvalschools.org)

Admin will complete Standards Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing Common Learning and Planning as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.

**Person Responsible** Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

**#2. 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.**

After reflecting on the 2022 FSA data, the Area of Focus remains student tasks and activities as it relates to standards based instruction. The data from the standards walkthroughs revealed that the instruction matched the information on the focus board and the materials used were aligned with the standards, but the students task alignment did not often coordinate with the standards which impacted the appropriate alignment to the learning arc of the standard.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

With a fairly new staff, teachers will engage in a refresh in standards based instruction learning plans procedures to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. By December 2022, we will want the standard walkthrough dashboard to show a better alignment with instructional materials and student task alignment as evident by a positive growth on PMA 1.

**Monitoring:**

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by using the approved Standards Walk-through tool and informal observations with timely authentic feedback. Based on the Standards Walk-through Tool, our admin team can measure classrooms that have student task alignment that coordinates with the standards.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Teachers will continue to collaborate and engage in tiered professional common learning opportunities involving unpacking standards to create aligned activities and tasks that are content grade level appropriate for where the teacher should be in the learning arc of the standard.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Collaboration and engaging in tiered professional learning opportunities will allow teachers the opportunity to work together on potential solutions to common barriers that are impacting student individual and collective 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.

Provide teachers with timed during planned faculty meetings and Common Planning to collaborate and engage in tiered professional learning opportunities for incorporating student use and understanding of the standards. Teachers will vet instructional materials to create student aligned task to support standard mastery. We will use the Standard Walk-through tool to calibrate and guide our discussion.

**Person Responsible** Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Focus Walks opportunities will be created by Admin to allow time for teachers to observe best practices of the targeted focus. We will use the Standard Walk-through tool to guide our calibration.

**Person Responsible** Daniel Copeland (copelandd@duvalschools.org)

Admin completing Standard Walk-through to ensure we have shared common definitions, evidence, and expectations across all grade level and contents will yield to evidence that our content teams consistently plan standards based instruction with aligned tasks and assessments. Admin will complete at least 2 walks together a day to ensure calibration is strong.

**Person Responsible** Aurelia Williams (raya@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.**

A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that 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. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholders is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

To build a more culturally sensitive environment for all stakeholders. Twin Lakes will continue with effective and consistence communicate between school and home using our various communication vehicles in English and Spanish (when available). Parents will be encouraged to attend and join the only decision making bodies (SAC and PTSA). After events, we will have surveys to gather parents feedback. We will increase student engagement and presence by increasing opportunities for students to have a voice in how the learn. Encourage teachers to build a solid relationship with students and parents. We will continue with the Wolves Den and TLAM bucks as incentive for positive behavior. For teachers, we will continue to provide professional development on creating a culturally sensitive learning environment. We will also continue to build capacity in our teacher leaders and providing opportunities for others to lead and share their craft with others. Admin will continue to celebrate and serve our teachers monthly to show our appreciation.