

Duval County Public Schools

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

8801 LAKE PLACID DR E, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Willis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (36%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

8801 LAKE PLACID DR E, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

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	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	98%

School Grades History

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

Martin Luther King Jr. School of the Arts will provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary, every student is inspired and prepared for success in middle school and beyond.

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
Willis, Andrea	Principal	
Williams Scott, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Hite, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	
Harb, Zayna	Instructional Coach	
Payne, Marva	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Andrea Willis

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.*

1

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

350

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	50	66	57	55	57	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	6	5	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	16	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	6	8	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/20/2022

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	22	51	45	67	42	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269
Attendance below 90 percent	8	18	21	26	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	7	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	12	20	38	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	6	3	6	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	2	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	22	51	45	67	42	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269
Attendance below 90 percent	8	18	21	26	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	7	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	12	20	38	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	6	3	6	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	2	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	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	28%	50%	56%				23%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	36%						34%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						41%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	48%	50%				48%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%						55%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						65%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	12%	59%	59%				22%	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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	19%	52%	-33%	58%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	19%	50%	-31%	56%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

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	68%	61%	7%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	64%	-32%	64%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
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	16	28		16	44	45					
BLK	28	37	37	35	51	50	12				
FRL	27	36	35	30	45	47	8				

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		50		9							
BLK	22	30	57	35	29	43	5				

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
FRL	20	33	67	33	29	50	4				
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	6	28	28	17	56	71					
BLK	22	32	39	47	55	62	19				
FRL	22	32	38	46	55	62	17				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	251
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
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 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	36
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas are the deficits in reading achievement.

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

The greatest need for improvement in my school is in the content of reading.

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 our reading deficit are that students are beginning the school year off already two or more grade levels behind in reading. We also lost our reading coach after only 2 months. The new actions to take place are small group remediation sessions beginning earlier in the school year to help close gaps. Groups need to start being pulled immediately after baseline data is collected.

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

Math showed the most improvement.

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

Highly qualified teachers in math have been teaching the same content in the same grade for several years. The instructional math coach consistently plans with the math teachers.

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

Teachers will have to get acclimated to the new standards and curriculum as well as closely monitoring the data collected from both formative and summative assessments.

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.

Professional development this year will be facilitated in small group rotations based on needs and interest. A lot of P.D. work will be centered around aligned assessments and standards based instruction.

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

WOW Wednesdays will be implemented this school year to protect vertical articulation planning days.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

FSA scores determined that ELA was our lowest performing content.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome that MLK plans to achieve this year are an increase in the frequency and consistency of common planning times which will allow a more collaborative environment which will help increase the number of proficient students we have. We will have common planning every Tuesday, WOW Wednesdays every Wednesday and optional planning slots on Thursdays.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional practice will be monitored using the new walkthrough tool as well as attending and engaging in common planning and P.L.C. sessions along with frequent data chats. The common planning agenda is turned in weekly with the notes and sign in sheets.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for increasing instructional practices is collaboration or peer-to-peer learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

This strategy was selected because it is proven to increase teacher competency and it is also a strategy that we use at MLK, but needs to be fine tuned. According to our 5 essentials survey data, peer collaboration has been an area that needed improvement. This year we have built in multiple planning days within a week and with two different schools and two sets of coaches. Our teachers have been able to bounce ideas off of one another and really dig deep into unpacking the new Benchmarks.

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. Weekly Common Planning Sessions with interventionists paid by Title I as peer/ expert teachers to unpack benchmarks and align lessons to materials and assessments.

Person Responsible Zayna Harb (harbz@duvalschools.org)

2. Monthly PLC's

Person Responsible Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

3. Supplemental Assistant Principal will work with leadership and teachers to implement PLC, Common Planning and district walk throughs

Person Responsible Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

4. Out of state Professional learning opportunities to Ron Clark Academy and EIE in Boston for science and STEM.

Person Responsible Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

5. Title I funds will be utilized to purchase supplemental positions, professional development for teachers/ staff, academic resources, materials, and supplies. (Paraprofessional, part-time tutor, family engagement app, items from the store room, Acaletics, teacher easels, doc cams, Everglades math, Rally ELA, and P.D.)

Person Responsible Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

6. Teachers will participate in professional development outside of the school day to refine teaching practices aligned with benchmarks

Person Responsible Stephanie Hite (hites1@duvalschools.orf)

7. Additional laptops, charges and headphones will be used with blended learning and assessments

Person Responsible Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

8. Reflex Math will be used to differentiate math learning for all grade levels

Person Responsible Zayna Harb (harbz@duvalschools.org)

9. Students will be provided with field experiences to see reading and math benchmarks in the real world with the opportunity to go to the Jacksonville Zoo

Person Responsible Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, 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 ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Instructional practices in K-2 will include planning collaboratively as well as specific PLC's on guided reading, small group instruction and data analysis.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Instructional practices in 3-5 will include planning collaboratively as well as specific PLC's on gradual release, checks for understanding and data analysis.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

At least 75% of my students in K-2 will be reading at their grade level band and able to comprehend what they have just read.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

At least 50% of my students in 3-5 will be reading at their grade level band and able to comprehend what they have just read.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Our area of focus will be monitored weekly through class visits utilizing the standards walkthrough tool as well as progress monitoring weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Willis, Andrea, willisa@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based practice program that we will be using is weekly common planning. Peer-to-peer learning is a strong method of increasing both teacher and student achievement. Planning aligns with the reading plan and teachers will be able to fully understand the task demands of the BEST standards during these sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Common Planning time will address the need of increasing student achievement in ELA. In other schools with similar demographics, student achievement has increased when common planning time is protected.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Weekly common planning	Willis, Andrea, willisa@duvalschools.org
Monthly PLC's	Williams Scott, Andrea, williamsa7@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.

We are implementing the Ron Clark house system this year which encourages students to work together and gives the sense of belonging. Staff will attend the Ron Clark Experience Academy to fully implement these strategies with our teachers and students. Additionally, a PBIS store will be available for students who earn incentives through the house points system.

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

The stakeholders include all faculty, staff and students as well as parents, community members and business partners. We also have a few region level stakeholders. Each student must do their part in being an honest and active member of their house. Faculty and staff will monitor, teach and redirect as necessary while also being a part of their house. Our religious partners this year are Mt. Nebo who allow us to use their parking lot and provide shelter if we need a safe space and Restoration Baptist Church who provided goodie bags and a hot breakfast for all educators during pe-planning. RBC will also began pushing in on Wednesdays to read with our primary classes in November.