Greenfield Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Greenfield Elementary School

6343 KNIGHTS LN N, Jacksonville, FL 32216

http://www.duvalschools.org/greenfield

Demographics

Principal: Tangia Anderson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Greenfield's Mission is to create a positive and secure environment for learning in a changing community where staff and students strive to meet their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement

Greenfield's Vision: A Community working together to meet the needs of ALL students.

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
Anderson, Tangia	Principal	Tangia Anderson serves as the school's Instructional Leader, Principal. Mrs. Anderson will ensure Standards-based planning and instructional delivery are implemented daily to increase student achievement. She will empower teachers to transform teaching and learning by modeling best practices and providing knowledgeable, data-driven feedback. Mrs. Anderson will establish a safe and secure culture that supports academic and non-academic endeavors while monitoring school discipline that promotes a productive learning environment. She will engage all stakeholders in on-going opportunities to support the school and the District's vision and goals to accelerate student learning.
Garner, Gwen	Assistant Principal	Gwen Garner-Kling serves as the school's Assistant Principal. Mrs. Garner-Kling will assist the principal in ensuring Standards-based planning and instructional delivery are implemented daily to increase student achievement. She will establish a safe and secure culture that supports academic and non-academic endeavors while monitoring school discipline that promotes a productive learning environment. She will support the principal in engaging all stakeholders in on-going opportunities to support the school and the District's vision and goals to accelerate student learning.
Watts, James	Instructional Coach	James Watts serves as the school's Math Coach. Mr. Watts will be responsible for providing teachers instructional support in developing their pedagogy and craft in mathematical thinking, concepts, skills, and strategies. He will model lessons, observe teaching practices and provide corrective feedback to improve instructional planning and delivery resulting in improved student achievement in Math and Science.
Williams, Suzannah	Instructional Coach	Ms. Williams serves as the school's ELA/Reading Coach. Ms. Williams will be responsible for providing teachers support in developing pedagogy and craft in concepts, skills and strategy implementation necessary for students to become proficient readers and writers. She will model lessons, observe teaching practices and provide corrective feedback to improve instructional planning and delivery resulting in improved student achievement English Language Arts.
Schmidt, Chrissy	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Schmidt serves as the school's CSS Instructional Coach Mrs. Schmidt will be responsible for providing teachers support in developing pedagogy and craft in concepts, skills and strategy implementation necessary for students to become proficient readers and writers. She will

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		model lessons, observe teaching practices and provide corrective feedback to improve instructional planning and delivery resulting in improved student achievement in English Language Arts/Math/ Science/Social Skills.
Vincent, Lisa	Other	Mrs. Vincent is our school's Reading Interventionist. She will provide daily small group instruction to students identified in need of tier 2 and 3 support in ELA/Reading Language Arts.
Joseph, Mesharn	Guidance Counselor	MeSharn Joseph serves as the School Counselor. She will assist teachers, students, and parents by providing full service support to improve academic and non-academic goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/29/2019, Tangia Anderson

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.*
15

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.*
35

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
50

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%

2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (58%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Dustin Sims](#)
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	94	103	84	96	101	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	20	15	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	2	1	5	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	7	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	4	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	45	58	60	48	41	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	56	81	60	57	40	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325

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	47	59	56	46	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272

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	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	105	110	94	103	124	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	32	28	26	21	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	10	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	37	59	40	64	66	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323

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	28	39	32	44	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232

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	8	1	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	105	110	94	103	124	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	32	28	26	21	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	10	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	37	59	40	64	66	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	323

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	28	39	32	44	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232

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	8	1	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	50%	50%	57%	52%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	58%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	51%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	63%	64%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	62%	61%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	52%	51%	33%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	48%	48%	53%	70%	55%	55%

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	40%	51%	-11%	58%	-18%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	8%					
05	2019	45%	50%	-5%	56%	-11%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison	-3%					

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
	2018	68%	60%	8%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	12%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
	2018	61%	61%	0%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	23	41	41	41	54	47	19				
ELL	35	59	55	54	60	41	32				
ASN	67	65		83	80						
BLK	44	65		57	76	70	36				
HSP	36	59	57	57	65	39	23				
MUL	68	69		63	46						
WHT	57	70		70	63		61				
FRL	46	69	72	61	70	52	49				

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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	25	43	44	30	39	32	33				
ELL	38	58	57	60	59	42	77				
ASN	73	79		82	79		90				
BLK	43	59		49	50		53				
HSP	43	43	32	65	58	35	75				
MUL	67			58							
WHT	55	55		68	61	38	74				
FRL	53	58	59	63	58	31	69				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	62

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	67
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	61
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

Due to COVID-19, all data is based on the 2018-2019 assessments.

Science was our lowest performing subject with the 2019 state assessments scores. Our fifth grade team scored at 48% proficiency in comparison to 70% in 2018 and 39% in 2017. The contributing factors were teacher placement, district specialist support availability and the performance of the students overall in fifth grade.

When Greenfield scored at 70% in 2018, we had two experienced teachers that led Science. In 2019, we had one of those teachers moved to fourth grade and added a new teacher to the math and science team in fifth grade. That teacher was in the second year

of teaching. The combination of only being a second year teacher and adding another subject (math) to the daily instruction was a contributing factor.

Additionally, in 2018, we had a designated Science Specialist that supported our teachers and students regularly, which contributed to intensive support. The services were not available for the 2018-2019 school year.

A final concern would be the data points for the fifth grade as a whole. When those students were in third and fourth grade, we tracked low testing performance and data for this group of students across the grade level and it continued in to fifth grade.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from 70% to 48%. However, in 2017, the science score was 39%. Greenfield's history for Science scores have been consistently around 50% proficiency. The 70% proficiency was a great achievement for our science teachers.

In comparison with the state and district scores for science, Greenfield was at 48% proficiency this year, with the district average for proficiency at 49% and the state average for proficiency being 53%.

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

The data component showing the greatest gap when compared to the state average is English
Language Arts Achievement. The school's data reflects 50% proficient, while the state average is 57% proficient.

Grade level breakdown compared to the state:
3rd Grade Proficiency 40% - State Proficiency 58%
4th Grade Proficiency 50% - State Proficiency 58%
5th Grade Proficiency 45% - State Proficiency 56%

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

The data component showing the most improvement is Math lowest 25% with an increase of 18%. The data reflected 51% of the lowest performing students increased in Math in 2019 compared to 33% in 2018.

The increase was a result of administration, instructional coaches, and VE teachers intentionally working with the lowest performing students.

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

Based on the results for our students with disabilities, the 2018-2019 data reflects 38% scored below the district's average of 41% as required by the Every Students Succeed Act (ESSA).

Areas of concern for students with disabilities are:
1. Students lack of attendance

2. Students transferring from multiple schools within a school year
3. Students' work reflecting below grade level standards

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

1. Increase overall students' scores in ELA, Math, and Science by 11% and higher
2. Build a collaborate school culture
3. Celebrate achievement for teachers and students
4. Increase parent and family engagement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Maintain and Increase Student Achievement in ELA Rationale: The 2019 Florida Standards Assessment data reflects 50% of the students in grades 3 through 5 performed at or above the proficiency level in English Language Arts, which matched the state's average of students performing on grade level. The data further shows that students who performed at or above proficiency, 4th-grade students increased by 1%, while 3rd-grade students decreased by 3% and 5th-grade students decreased by 7% as compared to the 2018 school year.
Measureable Outcome:	The goal is to increase overall student proficiency levels to 55% and above, to increase 4th-grade lowest performing students to 65% and above, and maintain learning gains 63%-100% in English Language Arts.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gwen Garner (garnerg@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize Performance Matters - District and School's Standards-Based Assessments Hire Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist Implement Small Group Instruction and Tutoring Provide Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for Grades 3-5 Provide student access to i-Ready and Achieve Provide Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE) Grades K-2 Implement iReady and Achieve 3000 with fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. A Reading Coach position will be used to design, monitor, and assess reading achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers. 2. A Reading Interventionist position will be used to support student learning in small groups to improve reading and writing skills. 3. Materials will be purchased to support the lowest performing students for tutoring. Materials include but are not limited to LLI kits, Reading Mastery, and online subscriptions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Unpack the Standards for effective planning and providing Standards-based Instruction.
2. Analyze data from multiple data sets (i-Ready, Achieve, and Standards Mastery).
3. Use students' data to effectively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3.
4. Implement supplemental instructional support with fidelity (Leveled-Literacy Intervention-LLI).
5. Weekly Common Planning with Administration and Instructional Coaches.
6. Implementation of interactive learning centers to enhance student engagement.
7. Utilization of classroom libraries, providing opportunities for students to practice concepts, skills, and strategies.
8. Provide Reading Mastery Signature Edition Professional Development Training.
9. Engage students in theatrical field experiences which correlates to the ELA Standards.
10. Use printers and CD players for students to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible	Gwen Garner (garnerg@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Maintain and Increase Student Achievement in Math Rationale: The 2019 Florida Standards Assessment data reflects 64% of the students in grades 3 through 5 performed at or above the level in Math, which is 1% above the state's average of students performing on grade level. The data further shows that students who performed at or above proficiency, 3rd-grade students increased by 5%, while 4th-grade students maintained 73% proficiency, and 5th-grade students decreased by 10% as compared to the 2018 school year.
Measureable Outcome:	The goal is to increase overall student proficiency levels to 68% or higher, measurable maintain students' learning gains 81%-100% in Math grades 3 and 4, increase learning gains for students in grade 5 from 38% to 44% or higher, and increase lowest performing students from 43% to 56% or higher in grades 4 and 5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize Performance Matters - District and School's Standards-Based Assessments Hire Math Coach and Math Tutors Implement Small Group Instruction and Tutoring Provide Acaletics Math Supplement to support instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. A Math Coach position will be used to design, monitor, and assess math achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers. 2. Tutors and paras will be used to support small group instruction to improve students' math skills. 3. Materials will be purchased to support the lowest performing students for tutoring. Materials include but are not limited to Acaletics, iReady, and online subscriptions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Unpack the Standards for effective planning and providing Standards-based Instruction.
2. Analyze data from multiple data sets (i-Ready, Achieve, and Standards Mastery).
3. Use students' data to effectively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3.
4. Implement supplemental instructional support with fidelity (Acaletics).
5. Weekly Common Planning with Administration and Instructional Coaches.
6. Implementation of interactive learning centers to enhance student engagement.
7. Utilization of classroom libraries, providing opportunities for students to practice concepts, skills, and strategies.
8. Provide Acaletics Professional Development Training.
9. Engage students in theatrical field experiences which correlates to the Math Standards.

Person Responsible	Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Increase Student Achievement in Science Rationale: The 2019 Next Generation Science Standards data reflects 48% of the students in grade 5 performed 5% below the state's average of students performing on grade level. The data further shows that students proficiency level in Science decreased by 22% compared to the 2018 school year.
Measureable Outcome:	The goal is to increase overall student proficiency levels to 53% or higher outcome the in 5th grade Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize Performance Matters - District and School's Science PMAs Use Achieve 3000 Utilize Instructional Coaches to support teacher Provide Small Group Instruction and Tutoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The Instructional Coaches will be used to design, monitor, and assess reading achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers. 2. Tutors and paras will be used to support small group instruction to improve students' Science skills. 3. Materials will be purchased to support the lowest performing students for tutoring. Materials include but are not limited to iReady and online subscriptions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Unpack the Standards for effective planning and providing Standards-based Instruction.
2. Analyze data from multiple data sets (Achieve).
3. Use data to effectively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3.
4. Weekly Common Planning with Administration and Instructional Coaches.
5. Implementation of interactive learning centers to enhance student engagement.
6. Utilization of classroom libraries, providing opportunities for students to practice concepts, skills, and strategies.
7. Engage students in field experiences which correlates to the NGSS Science Standards.

Person Responsible   Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Students with Disabilities Rationale: Based on the results of students with disabilities, the current data reflects 38% scored below the district's average of 41% as required by the Every Students Succeed Act (ESSA).
Measureable Outcome:	The goal is to increase students with disabilities to achieve above 50% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize Performance Matters - District and School's Standards-Based Assessments Hire Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist Hire Math Coach Implement Small Group Instruction and Tutoring Provide Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for Grades 3-5 Provide student access to i-Ready and Achieve Provide Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE) Grades K-2 Implement iReady and Achieve 3000 with fidelity Provide Acaletics-Math Supplemental Materials Professional Development Training
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. General education teachers and varying exceptionalities teachers will collaborate to provide differentiated instruction to support students with disabilities. 2. Reading and Math Coach positions will provide professional development training and lesson planning with teachers to implement standards-based differentiated instruction. 3. Reading Interventionist position will be used to support student learning in small groups to improve reading and writing skills. 4. Paraprofessional and tutors will support student learning in Reading, Math, and Science. 5. Materials will be purchased to support the lowest performing students for tutoring. Materials include but are not limited to LLI kits, Reading Mastery, Acaletics, and online subscriptions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Unpack the Standards for effective planning and providing Standards-based Instruction.
2. Analyze data from multiple data sets (i-Ready, Achieve, and Standards Mastery).
3. Use students' data to effectively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3.
4. Implement supplemental instructional support with fidelity (Leveled-Literacy Intervention-LLI, Acaletics, RMSE).
5. Weekly Common Planning with Administration and Instructional Coaches.
6. Implementation of interactive learning centers to enhance student engagement.
7. Utilization of classroom libraries, providing opportunities for students to practice concepts, skills, and strategies.
8. Provide Reading Mastery Signature Edition Professional Development Training.
9. Teachers will engage in a book study learn various strategies to support students with disabilities.
10. Engage students in theatrical field experiences which correlates to the ELA Standards.

**Person
Responsible**   Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Classroom instruction aligned to Standards-based Instruction and data from the 19-20 Standards Walk Through Tool revealed: • 90% of the teachers' instruction in grades kindergarten through fifth grade were aligned to the materials. However, 40% of the students' assessments were aligned to the Learning Arc, indicating inconsistencies with observations and standards alignment. Additional data from the 5Essential Survey indicated that students rated academic engagement at 91%. However, instructional leadership and collaborative practices were weak, 36%.
Measureable Outcome:	Ninety-five percent (95%) of our teachers will engage in effective standards-based instruction for teaching and assessing to build students' proficiency in grade-level mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based planning to determine tasks and materials selected are aligned to instructional delivery for student mastery. Our team will use the Standards Walkthrough Tool to measure teachers' instruction, and tasks are aligned to standards. Use the District's TalentEd/Perform Tool to provide formal and informal teachers' observations (Planning & Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Administration will be on one accord regarding standards-based instruction's evidence and findings. 2. Admin and Instructional Coaches will collaborate, monitor, and development next steps to improve teachers' instruction. 3. Focus Walks data will be monitor to determine consistent alignment to standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure administration meets weekly to calibrate findings and evidence to develop actionable next steps.
2. Review the School Improvement Plan to align Standard-based Instruction with the leadership team.
3. Train the teachers and support staff on the School Improvement Plan and the alignment to Standard-based Instruction.
4. Provide professional development to increase the quality and rigor of teaching and learning.
5. Ensure teachers attend weekly PLC and Common Planning meetings to develop learn and develop lessons to use the Achievement Level Descriptors-ALD and Item Specs to create assessments that aligned to grade-level standards.
6. Analyze the District's assessments and make adjustments to align with the standards when they are not aligned. After the students are assessed, analyze the results to determine

changes met the required expectation.
7. Include the Standards Focus Walk dial-in weekly data updates to faculty to measure improvement.

Person Responsible   Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)

8. Continue implementing District's initiatives with fidelity, provide on-going training, and monitor progress (Leveled-Literacy Intervention-LLI, RMSE, Achieve 3000, I-Ready, Acaletics).
9. Use progress monitoring to make adjustments as needed to improve student learning.

Person Responsible   Gwen Garner (garnerg@duvalschools.org)

10. Support teachers by building positive individual relationships that will strengthen the teacher/administration trust, thus providing a collaborative school culture to increase responses on the 5Essentials Survey.
11. Continue providing team building activities to develop a cohesive and collaborative culture.

Person Responsible   Tangia Anderson (andersont2@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Greenfield's leadership team will meet weekly to monitor and provide evidence of schoolwide improvement initiatives in the following areas for school improvement:
* Increase overall students' scores in ELA, Math, and Science by 11% and higher than the 2018-2019 scores (No student scores for 2019-2020).
* Ensure ninety-five percent (95%) of our teachers will engage in effective standards-based instruction for teaching and assessing to build students' proficiency in grade-level mastery.
* Build a collaborate school culture
* Celebrate achievement for teachers and students
* Increase parent and family engagement

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.

Greenfield Elementary School will build a strong school culture by increasing teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-support staff, teacher-to-administration, faculty-to-parent, and parent engagement within the school. Administration, teachers, and parents will collaborate to establish targeted and meaningful family workshops to support and empower student academics and social success. Parents will have an opportunity to volunteer at the school and attend decision-making meetings focused on overall school improvement.

Greenfield's activities/events to increase faculty and family engagement include:
1. Implement team building activities to develop a cohesive and collaborative culture
2. Provide teachers an opportunity to complete a survey or needs assessment so that I can better understand where they need assistance
3. Nightly Parent Events to build relationship and empower parent to work with their students
4. ELL Parental Workshops
5. SAC
6. PTA
7. Stakeholders Meetings

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.