

Duval County Public Schools

Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School

700 ORANGE AVE, Baldwin, FL 32234

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

Demographics

Principal: Katherine K IR Kland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School

700 ORANGE AVE, Baldwin, FL 32234

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

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 college or a career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary, our vision is to ensure students show leadership qualities and character to reach their maximum academic growth through rigorous standards and the use of individual goal setting.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lee, Marianne	Principal	Review school wide student performance data through monthly meetings, monitor implementation of three tired interventions and student data, identify further professional development needs.
Pinter, Marissa	Assistant Principal	Review school wide student performance data through monthly meetings, monitor implementation of three tired interventions and student data, identify further professional development needs.
Piper, Colette	Teacher, K-12	Attend district trainings, monitor implementation of three tired interventions and student data, grade level common planning meetings with data chats and monitor implementation of three tired interventions and student data, identify further professional development needs
Wilms, Kelli	Teacher, ESE	Provide perspective to the team how the academic and SEL plans for the school are implemented for our most struggling students who have been identified as ESE. She then relays that information to her ESE team.
Jackson, Charise	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leadership Team member for math and 5th grade.
Wall, Vicki	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leadership Team member and leader for 1st grade
Macedo, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leadership Team member and Kindergarten leader
Blank, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Leadership Team member and 2nd Grade leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Katherine K IR Kland

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast

Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	56	59	53	56	65	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	341
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	36	41	27	30	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	55	50	58	62	62	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	15	10	17	17	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	4	4	3	1	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	19	22	26	44	39	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183

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	17	18	32	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	14	20	13	39	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Students retained two or more times	14	30	34	26	40	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	55	50	58	62	62	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	15	10	17	17	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	4	4	3	1	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	19	22	26	44	39	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183

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	17	18	32	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	14	20	13	39	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Students retained two or more times	14	30	34	26	40	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	50%	57%	49%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	52%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	39%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	62%	63%	53%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	62%	46%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	52%	51%	31%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	48%	53%	49%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	51%	-9%	58%	-16%
	2018	62%	50%	12%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	63%	59%	4%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
	2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	60%	57%	3%	60%	0%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	22	38		41	48						
BLK	29	41		25	35						
HSP	50			75							
MUL	30			60							
WHT	47	59	44	65	68	33	73				
FRL	33	56	53	45	54	29	44				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	46	50	59	59	55	44				
BLK	45	63		57	65						
WHT	55	56	60	65	68	57	53				
FRL	50	59	71	63	67	56	63				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	38	44	19	30	29	14				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
BLK	49	59		49	52		47				
HSP	27										
WHT	51	52	32	54	43	31	56				
FRL	45	49	38	48	44	35	48				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students 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	
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
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	45
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	56
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest data points for Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary is in the area of reading. The subgroups that performed under 41% proficiency is our Students with Disabilities and Black Students. ELA Learning Gains that are also below 41% are Students with Disabilities subgroup.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

4th Grade Reading and 3rd Grade Math proficiencies all had 23% decline, which is our greatest decline in 18-19. 4th Grade reading had two teachers for reading instruction. In the middle of the year, a new teacher was hired who did not have experience as it was her first year teaching. 3rd Grade Math had a teacher with experience, but she was the only teacher in math on that grade level, which was different from the previous school year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

When compared to the state average, our school's 3rd grade math performance was the largest gap. Again, this teacher was the only teacher who taught math on that grade level. The change in the rotational time and scheduling was difficult and the amount of time allotted was not conducive to meeting the needs of students.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

5th Grade Math performance maintained and did not drop. There were no improvements from the previous school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance is a great concern in our school and the percentage of students who need additional assistance due to free/reduced lunch status.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Improve 4th grade overall reading proficiency levels.
2. Improve 5th grade overall reading proficiency levels.
3. Maintain or increase 5th Grade math proficiency levels
4. Improve 5th grade learning gains in reading
5. Improve 5th grade learning gains in math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our students in 18-19 scored 42% proficiency in 3rd grade; 39% proficiency in 4th grade; and 41% proficiency in 5th grade. Our students with disabilities (SWDs) scored 22% proficiency and our black students scored 29% proficiency. In addition, our students with disabilities scored 38% making a learning gain. Our black students scored 41% learning gains. Our free and reduced students scored 33% proficiency in 18-19 as well.

Measurable Outcome: For the 3rd grade ELA our students would score at least 47% proficiency; 4th grade ELA would score 44% proficiency; and 5th grade ELA would score 46% proficiency. Students with Disabilities and Black Students would score 41% proficiency and learning gains at 41% for SWD students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Deepen implementation of Corrective Reading with students in the SWD, Black and Free/Reduced lunch students. Consistent monitoring of daily and weekly lessons. Data monitoring of students on mastery checks (after each group of 10 lessons) for all students and highlighted students in subgroups listed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Direct Instruction is a state-approved intervention for students who are struggling with reading phonics, fluency and basic comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Observations on Corrective Reading to ensure fidelity of all parts.

Person Responsible Kelli Wilms (farrok@duvalschools.org)

Weekly submission of lessons taught; Electronic Data Monitoring Sheet available in TEAMS ;

Person Responsible Marissa Pinter (pinterm1@duvalschools.org)

Create incentive plans for students who are passing their mastery check (after each 10 lessons); Scroll on morning announcements (Brag Time); Visual in the classroom of the mastery check

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Update student data sheet to add subgroup, specifically for Black and Free/Reduced lunch students. Quarterly data chats with students and reflect on PMAs, I-Ready Diagnostic, Achieve 3000 data, etc.. and set goals for students to improve.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Using Title I funds, add a reading intervention position to meet student's reading gaps using Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery to serve students in grades K-5.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our students in 18-19 scored 40% proficiency in 3rd grade; 63% proficiency in 4th grade; and 60% proficiency in 5th grade. Our students with disabilities (SWDs) scored 41% proficiency and our black students scored 25% proficiency. In addition, our black students scored 35% learning gains. Finally, our free and reduced lunch students in the lowest performing quartile performed at 29% as making a year's gain.

Measurable Outcome: For the 3rd grade Math our students would score at least 50% proficiency; 4th grade Math would score 64% proficiency; and 5th grade Math would score 63% proficiency. Black Students and Free/Reduced Lunch students would score 41% proficiency, including our lowest performing quartile for free/reduced lunch students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Deepen implementation of Acaletics Math with students in the Black and Free/Reduced lunch subgroups. Consistent monitoring of daily lessons. Using Standards Mastery assessment for planning small group instruction; to target the specific needs of the students. Data monitoring of students on monthly scrimmages for all students and highlighted students in subgroups listed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Acaletics Math has been proven to raise proficiencies and increase gains in various districts across the state of Florida. Using data to track and plan instruction to meet the needs of our subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students within those subgroups to highlight on a school-based data monitoring form. Update student data sheet to add subgroup, specifically for Black and Free/Reduced lunch students. Quarterly data chats with students and reflect on PMAs, I-Ready Diagnostic, Acaletics data, etc.. and set goals for students to improve.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Implement Acaletics Math with fidelity in grades 2-5. Use the checklist provided by Acaletics to ensure all parts of the "Math Club" are done. Use the Acaletics portal to pull data reports and modify instruction based on the reporting.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Use Standards Mastery and Acaletics to plan small group instruction to target specific needs of the students.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Use Standards Mastery and District lesson checks per standard for small group students; Increase Green Party participation monthly and class-based incentives for meeting small group goals.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Implement Guided Math small groups no less than 3 times per week for the Black and Free/Reduced Lunch subgroups of students in class.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Conduct Instructional Rounds on Small Group Math implementation and provide feedback to teachers on improving their instructional practice.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Using Title I funds, the school will have a dedicated math interventionist to assist with Acaletics intervention program with students in grades 2-5. Interventionist can also serve as a model for Guided Math groups.

Person Responsible Colette Piper (piper@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to the students being out of school for COVID-19, we expect for some students to struggle with their social-emotional well-being. We know that students who are focused on learning and can give their attention to the material being presented, are only able to do so due to the social-emotional well being. We strive to have healthy students who will then be able to concentrate on our main goal, learning.

Measurable Outcome: Until March 2020, our school had 70 disciplinary referrals. We hope to decrease this amount by 10% or more. Therefore, by March 2021, we expect to have 63 discipline referrals or less.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marissa Pinter (pinterm1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: All classroom teachers will implement Calm Classroom. (Evidence based research on the product's website)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the research citations on the Calm Classroom website, schools in the Chicago area have seen a reduction by 81% "more calm" for student success and 74% "more focused students" for engagement.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training to teachers via the Calm Classroom Academy (online training). Teaching materials, including teacher's edition, chime and student ambassador posters will be provided to teachers in PreK-5 classrooms.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Schedules aligned with providing teachers time in their instructional day for Calm Classroom implementation.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Monitoring of Calm Classroom implementation by classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Marissa Pinter (pinterm1@duvalschools.org)

Data Review will be shared with teachers quarterly to see if the implementation of Calm Classroom is making an impact on our behavior referrals.

Person Responsible Marissa Pinter (pinterm1@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During the 2019-20 school year, teachers at Mamie Agnes Jones on average scored 2.2 on a scale of 1-5 on the Standards Walkthrough Tool in the area of assessing students. Particular areas of focus would be on alignment to the Learning Arc of the standard and in FSA alignment.

Measurable Outcome: The goal for the 2020-21 school year is to increase the rating scale to at least 3.2 on a scale of 1-5 on the Standards Walkthrough Tool in the area of assesing students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using PLCs to develop learning arcs that align standards, instruction and assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: DuFour's works on Professional Learning Community and the 4 step process of ensuring student success on standards. Text: Learning by Doing via Solution Tree

Action Steps to Implement

Train Instructional Leadership Team on Learning Arcs and how it fits in with the DuFour PLC work we are beginning.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

With assistance of members of Instructional Leadership Team, one learning arc will be made at the August Early Dismissal session.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Use the Learning Arcs to follow the Plan-Do-Check-Act template in our weekly PLC meetings. Instructional Leadership Team members will help to facilitate.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Conduct Standards Based Walkthroughs and Instructional Rounds with instructional Leadership Team to measure the implementation of the learning arcs with a particular focus on assessments.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Provide individualize feedback for teachers based on instructional rounding.

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Document Cameras and other technology will be purchased using Title I funds to improve student achievement by allowing programs to be more interactive for students and teachers to display work more easily for discussion

Person Responsible Marianne Lee (leem3@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Redesigning the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) with representation from each grade level. The team will meet weekly or every 2 weeks The goal is to re-educate to what a PLC is, training on formative assessments, and always reflecting on the 4 questions for each PLC. This would help facilitate the move from Common Planning to PLC.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Based on data from our 2nd administration of the 5 Essentials School Survey, we have two areas to focus. One is with students and one is with teachers. The one for students is based on "Academic Personalism". This area scored the lowest of all of the items. Our 5th grade students who took the survey marked a significant decrease for the question from a score of 46 to a score of 5. Questions surrounding this area include: Noticing if students need assistance; Willing to give extra help on schoolwork if needed; Gives specific feedback to how i can improve in class and explaining things in a different way. Strategies to include are:

- *Pick one personal area for personal growth (academic or behavioral)
- *Go deeper with Growth Mindset and Mathematical Practices
- *Continue with Pow Wows monthly; Add dog tag for Growth Mindset piece; Growth piece (mid year & end of year)
- *Data Folder for each student; follow up with monitoring. School-wide cover for data folder (more universal and traveled with the student)
- *Student-Led Conferencing
- *Marzano's Levels of Understanding (Clip chart) (Student voice) (for whole group and centers)

For teachers, the greatest area of need is for "School Commitment". This area scored significantly low and a drop of 4 points from the previous year. Questions surrounding this area include: Feeling loyal to the school; Recommend this school to parents when seeking a place for their child; I usually look forward to each working day at this school; and I wouldn't want to work at any other school. Strategies to include are:

- *Carousel various charts including "Look forward to coming to work"
- *Advertise what made veteran teachers stay
- *Teacher Buddy (every teacher) Strong support from peer teachers
- *Teacher share in monthly faculty meetings

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$78,780.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$67,780.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of an interventionist to conduct reading groups with our most intensive students using Direct Instruction reading materials.</i>			
	5000	520-Textbooks	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	Title, I Part C		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading materials. (estimate)</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Cost of Brag Tags/Dog tags for student incentives and motivation.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$69,120.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$67,720.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of an interventionist to serve students who are most in need of support.</i>			
	3336	520-Textbooks	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$900.00
			<i>Notes: Acaletics Supplemental Instruction Program</i>			
	7760	510-Supplies	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	Other		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of dog tags to provide incentives for students to make math goals.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	9800	510-Supplies	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	Other	360.0	\$500.00
			<i>Notes: To purchase supplemental materials needed for the full implementation of Calm Classroom.</i>			
	5900	510-Supplies	2361 - Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School	Other	360.0	\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of Teacher's Editions of Calm Classroom lessons.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
					Total:	\$148,900.00