

Duval County Public Schools

# Waterleaf Elementary



## 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Lisa Brady Hewitt G**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<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)	76%
<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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (58%) 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>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

### 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 PK-5	No	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Waterleaf Elementary School develops inquisitive, independent thinkers and collaborative learners, who acquire the essential knowledge necessary to be career and college ready, and to be caring and creative contributors to the world around them.

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

Waterleaf Elementary School will foster an earnest passion for learning that inspires students to work with others in creating a better world for all.

### 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
Brady Hewitt, Lisa	Principal	
Montgomery, Tisa	Assistant Principal	
Mickle, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
Witucki, Julie	Teacher, ESE	
Kratz, Laura	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2022, Lisa Brady Hewitt G

**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.*

4

**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.*

14

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

32

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

643

**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	112	94	108	108	119	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	648
Attendance below 90 percent	0	28	23	22	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	1	7	22	25	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	1	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/1/2022

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	113	124	119	111	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	7	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	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	
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	4	2	7	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

**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	3	9	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	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	0	113	124	119	111	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	7	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	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	
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	4	2	7	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

#### 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	3	9	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	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	63%	50%	56%				64%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						59%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						43%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	48%	50%				70%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						63%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						44%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	59%	59%				64%	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	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	62%	50%	12%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	71%	61%	10%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
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	46	45	30	54	59	42	30				
ELL	33	30	38	59	68		36				
ASN	68	65		89	81						
BLK	59	56	27	60	64	48	44				
HSP	55	45	45	65	67		58				
MUL	63	70		83	60						
WHT	68	52	46	81	62		61				
FRL	56	49	38	66	67	42	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	39	45	44	50	52	57	27				
ELL	33			55							
ASN	63	67		70	75		67				
BLK	50	32		41	41		33				
HSP	56	56		68	50		67				
MUL	47			60							
WHT	67	67	70	77	74	80	58				
FRL	49	45	40	52	58	45	47				
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	30	44	27	40	46	34	39				
ELL	41	63	53	55	74	58	42				
ASN	76	58		90	71		73				
BLK	52	54	27	59	54	32	41				
HSP	58	59	50	58	67	50	53				
MUL	69	50		75	75						
WHT	67	64	50	74	61	53	74				
FRL	55	53	41	61	58	35	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	47
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	76
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	51
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	56
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	69
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	54
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?

Proficiency in Reading went down in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Reading proficiency in ESE is 45%.

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

Reading Gains (54%) and Bottom Quartile Reading Gains (42%).

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

Small group instruction with the ESE teacher needs to be targeted to the needs of the student. Self-contained classrooms need to be fully staffed.

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

3rd grade math proficiency went up 5 points; 4th grade math proficiency went up 5 points;

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

Small group plans were created to target student needs in all grades. Students benefitted from the individual/small group instruction they received.

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

A targeted approach to Tier 2 and Tier 3 work in Reading. All students will receive targeted reading instruction during the school day. Instruction will be based on individual need. Assessments will be used to make decisions for instruction.

#### 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.

K-5th grade teachers will attend Benchmark curriculum training. ESE teachers and gen. education teachers who will service ESE students will take inclusion training. During PLC, grade levels will work on adjusting targeted reading groups based on assessments and progress monitoring. WOW days will be provided to each grade level to monitor assessments and growth.

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

Small group instruction will take place daily. Students will work in a new curriculum and attend centers to hone their skills. A reading interventionist will be in place to assist struggling readers.

#### **Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description****and Rationale:**

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

ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities is a focus because we have been below the ESSA Federal Index of 41% for the past 2 years. We have improved to 45%, but will continue to focus on this subgroup.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities ESSA Federal Index will increase from 45% to 47%.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth as assessed by running records, standards based grade level assessments, and blended learning.
2. Analyze data; create new groups; continue the process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

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

SWD will receive intensive intervention through RtI daily for a minimum of 20 minutes. RtI will consist of small groups (2-5 students) and will use intervention materials based on individual need. This will be in addition to their IEP goals and their time spent with their ESE teacher.

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

RtI is research-based and, done with fidelity, will increase a student's growth. Criteria is based on scores on several assessments (STAR; i-Ready; Achieve 3000, PMA, FSA). These are used to place students into intervention groups. Resources are materials provided by the district (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000; BAS; LLI; Phonics for Reading.)

**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.

1. Collect data from diagnostics in Aug. (Freckle; i-Ready; Achieve 3000; PMAs, FSA)
2. Analyze the data to form groups
3. Form groups based on individual need.
4. Schedule an RtI block for each grade level and provide extra assistance to ensure small group size.
5. Implement RtI.

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@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.**

Assessing student learning as students move through the standard. Formative assessment based on daily tasks, exit tickets, and student understanding of the material impacts instructional decisions and evidence of alignment of instruction, task, assessment. Assessing student Learning was identified via the Standards Walk-Through tool. Dials indicate a 2.2/5.0 for overall Assessing Student Learning; .44/1.0 for Determining Mastery; and .20/1.0 for FSA Alignment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Assessing Student Learning will increase overall from 2.2 to 3.5 or higher. Subcategories will increase by a minimum of .4 on each category.

**Monitoring:**

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

Analyze assessment data for the standard and make decisions for whole group/small group/individual remediation if necessary.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

PLCs will be used to align assessment to the standard to ensure the task can allow students to show mastery of the standard, or the part of the standard focused on; aligns with the standard; and is FAST aligned.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

This specific strategy allows for professional learning when unpacking the BEST standard. It creates a deeper knowledge of the standard, allowing teachers to instruct students on every aspect of the standard. By doing so, teachers will be able to create tasks and assessments that will align to FAST.

**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.

PLC will be used to unpack the standard, understanding the vocabulary of the standard, utilizing resources, and breaking the standard down into objectives.

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Common Planning to create/identify aligned tasks and assessment opportunities.

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

Analyze assessment data for the standard and make decisions for whole group/small group/individual remediation if necessary.

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

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

Waterleaf 5th grade students scored 56% on the FSA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Waterleaf 5th grade students will increase the Science score from 56% to 68%.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth as assessed by District PMA's, standards based grade level assessments, unit assessments.
2. Analyze data; create plans based on the data; continue the process.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

75 minutes of time will be spent on Science daily.  
Science Lab for 60 minutes once a week.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Students will have more time dedicated to learning the science concepts.

**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.

PLC and monthly meeting will be held with the District Science Specialist.

**Person Responsible**

Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

Data from the district Science PMAs will be disaggregated and small groups will be made based on needs data.

**Person Responsible**

Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

**#4. 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.**

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.

- o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English

Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 34%, 4th grade is 54%, and 5th grade is 49%.

- o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 2, 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 grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 60% and 2nd - 65%

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

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

**Monitoring:**

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

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

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.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection.

Small Group Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

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

**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.

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

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@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.**

Positive school culture is built through our daily announcements, monthly student of the month activities, positive reinforcements for daily activities, community events such as Book Fair, Carnival, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, Chorus, school play/talent show, positive referrals, and Girls On the Run.

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

Stakeholders are invited monthly to the School Advisory Council meetings. Vision, mission, and School Improvement Plans are discussed and amended as needed with input from parents, students, faculty, and community participants.