Parkwood Heights Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

1709 LANSDOWNE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/parkwood

Demographics

Principal: Ashton Price J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

1709 LANSDOWNE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/parkwood

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	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.

In collaboration with family and community the mission of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to provide an academically rigorous learning experience in a safe environment for all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to do what is best for children as we develop competent independent learners who are eager to explore the possibilities of what they can become.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Price, Ashton	Principal	Responsible for all aspects of school operation.
Simpson, Delayna	Assistant Principal	Test Coordinator, data mining and assists in instructional planning.
Clark, Amy	Instructional Coach	Responsible for aspects of Reading and helps with the coaching of best practices in the area of reading.
Sapp, Demetrice	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2008, Ashton Price J

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.*
0

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
16

Total number of students enrolled at the school

290

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	40	37	45	47	42	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	18	12	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	6	27	28	18	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	11	28	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
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	9	26	24	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	3	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	48	45	44	44	65	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	0	16	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	30	0	40	33	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	32	0	41	36	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	26	39	32	29	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

2020-21 - 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	48	45	44	44	65	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	0	16	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	30	0	40	33	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	32	0	41	36	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	26	39	32	29	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				37%	50%	57%	40%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	56%	58%	43%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	62%	63%	56%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	63%	62%	69%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	51%	59%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	48%	53%	65%	55%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	26%	50%	-24%	56%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

First grade - I-Ready
Second grade - I-Ready
Third grade - PMA
Fourth grade - PMA
Fifth grade - PMA

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	33%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	38%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	25%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	11%	22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	9%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	8%	34%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	0%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	11%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	20%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	16%	24%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	9%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	16%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	12%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	9%	20%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	14%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	10%	18%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	13%	25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	47%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	43%	42%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	25%	36%
	English Language Learners	25%	57%	50%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8%	31%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	27%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	20%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	20%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	15%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	20%	20%
	English Language Learners	14%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	39%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	36%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	25%	21%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	26%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	28%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	17%	15%
	English Language Learners	13%	38%	38%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	42%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	41%	49%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	27%	29%
	English Language Learners	38%	50%	50%

Subgroup Data Review

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	21	30		35	42		36				
ELL	25	30		35							
BLK	28	37	30	42	38	31	30				
HSP	36			50							
WHT	54	33		76	91		67				
FRL	31	37		49	47	31	34				
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	13	22	29	24	37	29					
ELL	17			56							
BLK	33	43	38	48	58	40	30				
HSP	38			69							
WHT	49	65		51	50						
FRL	31	42	46	41	47	40	21				
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	16	31		31	71						
ELL	30			40							
BLK	33	38	47	47	65	63	50				
HSP	57			50							
WHT	57	56		83	89		87				
FRL	38	40	47	54	69	63	62				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Parkwood Heights Elementary on the 2019 state assessment lost 27 points in the area of Science. This lost was due to our inability to get students to master the tested standards. Instructor spent too much time reviewing standards that should have been mastered in previous grades.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Parkwood Heights Elementary on the 2019 state assessment lost 27 points in the area of Science. This lost was due to our inability to get students to master the tested standards. Instructor spent too much time reviewing standards that should have been mastered in previous grades.

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

Contributing factors to this decline was the inefficient background knowledge of students and the lack of proficiency on previous grade level standards. Ensuring that all students in all grade levels are receiving appropriate Science instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains showed the largest improvement with a 2% increase on the 2019 state assessment. Simply utilizing small group instruction and constantly trying to give our student equivalent experiences of the type of rigor they will have during assessments.

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

Contributing factors were the use of small group instruction and the use of equivalent assessment materials to that of the state assessment.

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

The strategies needed to to accelerate learning will continue to be equivalent experiences in all areas, in addition to increased professional development of reading and the components of effective reading 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.

The professional development opportunities will include common planning with the administrative team and coaches. A mentor program for first-year teachers to acclimate to standards and classroom management techniques.

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

The frequent use of instructional rounds as a way of gauging and measuring effectiveness in all areas of instruction. Professional development activities that are specific to our student and teacher needs. Use of part-time instructional coach to provide additional support to teachers and students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2019 state assessment for reading the level of proficiency decrease in the area of Reading by 3% point and lowest performing quartile also decreased by 4 percentage points. The current global pandemic students have been out of school. It is important that research based strategies are used to address students mastery of grade-level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the proficiency of students taking the FSA from 37% to 55%.
Monitoring:	Student's growth will be monitored via mastery checks and district-level progress monitoring assessments. Common planning will be used to disaggregate data and determine the effectiveness and next steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of Corrective Reading with fidelity in grades 3rd -5th. Teachers will utilize mastery checks along the way to determine students' progression. The learning arc will be used to dissect low standards identified by the mastery checks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Corrective Reading will be used to address fluency and reading comprehension for students in grades 3-5. This program has proven to remediate and advance students ability to read and comprehend on grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that all staff has the appropriate training to implement the Corrective Reading program with fidelity. Administrative classroom walk-throughs to gauge the use of the program and instructional effectiveness. Mentorship of first-year teachers using the program.

Person Responsible	Delayna Simpson (payned@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The use of Acaletics program with fidelity has been proven to increase student achievement in the area of mathematics.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students that are deemed proficient via the Math FSA from 51% to 60%.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored via monthly assessments and District Progress Monitoring Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of this program will allow us to extend exposure to concepts and skills as well as multi-domain exposure to concepts and skills within the designated class period.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The unique combination of content focused materials that are fully aligned with the more rigorous state standards, data driven instructional best practices, a system of assessment and accountability and ongoing formal and informal professional development.

Action Steps to Implement	
Appropriate training for staff responsible for delivering instruction to students.	
Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Monthly monitoring of standards not mastered via use of Acaletics tracking forms.	
Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Monthly teachers receives ongoing professional development.	
Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The increasing number of ELL's and parents that are having difficulty navigating the education landscape.
Measurable Outcome:	If families cultural diversities are recognized then we will create a safe and civil school that fosters student growth and development.
Monitoring:	Multi-lingual parent surveys will be used to monitor whether parents are getting the help and support they need from the school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delayna Simpson (payned@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The increasing number of ELL's and the needs of their families to adjust to American educational system has made a Parent Liaison a needed resource. As families continue to recover from the recent pandemic the ability to provide resources that will assist them in the recovery efforts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent Liaisons create a bridge between schools and families and encourages parental involvement.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development for all staff on MTSS system and resources for assisting students social and emotional needs.

Person Responsible	Demetrice Sapp (sappd2@duvalschools.org)

Parent Liaison will assist in scheduling and implementing data chats with parents and support their students academic needs.

Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

NA

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.

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.

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

Parkwood Heights Elementary builds and sustains positive relationships with local community by making sure
that they are a active part of our school community. We are always looking for opportunities to
help a business by giving them our student work to display or having a spirit night at their
business. We also invite our community partners to participate in our school activities.
As our local community begins to recover we will invite them to participate in our virtual
meetings. This will provide them an opportunity to be apart of our virtual community until we
are safe to host face-to-face meetings.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement**	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00

  https://www.floridacims.org