Englewood Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Englewood Elementary School

4359 SPRING PARK RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/englewood

Demographics

Principal: Lousa Reis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
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: C (51%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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.

Our Mission Statement:
Englewood Elementary provides students with the proper tools, skills, and experiences that support academic achievement and create opportunities for participation in a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision Statement:
Our students will be prepared academically, socially, and emotionally for the expectations of middle school and be productive participants in their communities and beyond.

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	
Reis, Luisa	Principal		Ensure all systems are in place in order for the school to function as an outstanding educational institution.
Domingo, Angela	Assistant Principal		Ensure that the vision and mission of the school, along with the directives of the Principal are being implemented with fidelity.
Reshard, Charanda	Guidance Counselor		Ensure that the vision and mission of the school, along with the directives of the Principal are being implemented with fidelity.
Richardson, Kate	Teacher, K-12		Ensure that the vision and mission of the school, along with the directives of the Principal are being implemented with fidelity.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Lousa Reis

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

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

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

464

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

2

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

0

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	69	82	66	88	94	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	45	27	39	38	47	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	42	52	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

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	84	75	99	110	85	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	43	26	28	39	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	0	8	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	1	8	7	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	5	1	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	

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	84	75	99	110	85	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	43	26	28	39	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	0	8	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	1	8	7	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	5	1	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	

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	28%			39%	50%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%			52%	56%	58%	47%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%			56%	50%	53%	34%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	43%			61%	62%	63%	73%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%			59%	63%	62%	74%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%			46%	52%	51%	53%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	34%			41%	48%	53%	55%	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	32%	51%	-19%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	50%	-18%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	53%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For grades K-2 ELA and Math, the iReady diagnostic tool was used as the progress monitoring tool. For grades 3-5 for both ELA and Math, the PMA diagnostic was used as the progress monitoring tool.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	22	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	23	42
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	33
	English Language Learners	0	7	14
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	14	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	15	36
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	33
	English Language Learners	0	10	16

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4	20	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	29	41
	Students With Disabilities	0	12	25
	English Language Learners	3	12	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	15	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	24	38
	Students With Disabilities	38	12	12
	English Language Learners	3	12	31

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	24	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	30	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	17	0
	English Language Learners	8	10	10
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	34	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	40	36
	Students With Disabilities	17	14	17
	English Language Learners	19	26	33

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	22	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	23	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	21	14
	English Language Learners	4	6	9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	20	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	23	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	14
	English Language Learners	18	15	21

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	28	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	29	16	16
	English Language Learners	12	12	9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	43	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	45	45
	Students With Disabilities	35	22	21
	English Language Learners	31	38	48
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	6	59		26	65		12				
ELL	19	49	43	41	78	71	34				
ASN	62			69							
BLK	25	30		30	30		33				
HSP	14	46	45	39	79	77	17				
WHT	42			58							
FRL	30	51		43	61		33				
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	17	41	57	31	52	47	17				
ELL	27	42	42	55	65	48	36				
ASN	43	35		90	89		50				

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
BLK	38	60		50	41		25				
HSP	28	48	45	53	61	48	50				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	54	56		67	58		36				
FRL	36	54	67	59	61	50	40				

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	13	20	15	35	67	50					
ELL	31	43	36	68	68	44	29				
ASN	67	67		86	80						
BLK	43	56	50	70	73	54	72				
HSP	34	35	18	68	65	43	41				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	52	38		77	86		45				
FRL	44	46	38	73	73	52	55				

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)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	391
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	48
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	65
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	30
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	46
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

Analysis

Data 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?

We continue to show a deficiency of improvement in proficiency levels in our subgroups. Overall our students with disabilities group are not demonstrating growth throughout the school year at a comparable rate to our general education students. Once FSA scores are released we predict a continued pattern of decline. Our struggles are most consistent in ELA, however Math is also showing lower proficiency than previous years.

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

Based on our progress monitoring tools, our ELLs and SWD students need additional support in developing English Language Proficiency and supported access to Grade Level content.

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

Due to many factors including the learning gap experienced by all of our students, it is evident that those students who had the least amount of support during the time where the school was not in person, are the ones most severely impacted this year. Our action steps to remediate this growing disparity are to continue to closely monitor Grade Level instruction access for all students. Also, to provide English Language Development coaching to all staff members to allow them opportunities to support students within the classroom.

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

Our 5th-grade mathematics scores showed significant improvement through all subgroups.

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

Teacher placement and teacher familiarity with student population. We will closely monitor strategies used in 5th grade in order to replicate the results in lower grades as well.

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

Our Master Scheduling is being modified in order to increase instructional times and minimize the loss of learning times due to transitions. We will continue to work with teachers on the understanding of grade-level standards with the goal to support each teacher on delivering GL instruction to all students, in addition to focused and prescriptive remediation.

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 is being planned at multiple levels for the upcoming school year.
Our areas of focus are mindset, understanding language acquisition, and content focus.
We will be conducting a staff book study on the Growth Mindset within the classroom. This will be facilitated by the administration and academic coaches.
For Language acquisition, we are planning to provide our Kindergarten teachers with GLAD strategies professional development facilitated by the ESOL department. For grades 1-5 we will present language strategies at each common planning, faculty meeting and other PD opportunities. With the allotted Instructional Coach allocation from the district per the ESSER funding, the goal would be to share with a neighboring school an ESOL Coach to support this school-wide initiative. Content Focus will be discussed at each team planning (90 minutes weekly) where teachers, instructional coaches, and administration review the curriculum guides for planning, discuss pedagogical strategies, and dive into standards learning arcs.

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

Focus on our subgroups will be closely monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. Support will be given within the classroom, through tutoring, implementation of the 4 step process to remediate learning loss.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our progress monitoring tools, our ELLs and SWD students need additional support in developing English Language Proficiency and supported access to Grade Level content. Our ELA scores show a declining proficiency level.
Measureable Outcome:	We will increase the teacher knowledge bank to Language strategies for students to access Grade Level Standards. We will increase V.E. teacher collaboration with General Education teacher to increase the learning opportunities of all students within the classroom as well as during support time.
Monitoring:	Increase monitoring walkthrough data evidenced by Standards-based instruction guides teaching and learning at the Grade Level. Monitor the blended learning platforms for iReady (K-2), Achieve 3000 and Freckle (3-5) for fidelity and data usage.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The administration will lead the work of scheduling and ensuring collaboration between GE and VE Teachers. We will continue to monitor VE and ELL student progress and place students appropriately through the use of the CPSTeam. Language acquisition strategies will be used in all classrooms to ensure students who are at the ELP levels below proficient still have access to content without diminished rigor due to language barriers. In grades K-2 the focused use of the newly implemented Benchmark Advance Curriculum will be closely monitored to ensure that all students are receiving GL content appropriately and assessed regularly to obtain ongoing data. We will use the additional time with our Media Specialist (Library) to support students reading skills and referencing skills to improve overall ELA proficiency. Tutors will be hired to work with targeted groups of students to provide support in minimizing the learning gap and bringing students closer to grade level mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies above are being used from the monitoring to assessing in order to track progress and growth for all students, but more specifically, to ensure our ELL and VE population do not continue to fall far behind in all areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan and implement units/lessons that are Grade Level and standards-based and aligned assessment for standard-based unit/lesson through guidance and support from our Coach.
2. Closely work with K-2 teachers to implement the new ELA curriculum with fidelity.
3. Differentiated small group instruction focusing on the 5 components of reading on a daily basis. These groups will be flexible based on progress monitoring data.
3. Utilize DI programs will fidelity and accurate progress monitoring data will be collected as prescribed by the program. Leadership will monitor DI progress monitoring data on a monthly basis.
4. Teachers will engage in frequent data chats with students.
5. Meaningful data-driven common planning sessions which include planning for small group instruction.
6. Leadership will engage in 1:1 data chats with teachers at the end of each grading period.
7. Reading interventionist will provide targeted small group instruction for tier-2 students.
8. Paraprofessionals will be used in the classroom setting to provide DI using Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading programs to support student achievement.
9. Media Specialist (Library) will support students reading skills and referencing skills to improve overall

ELA proficiency.
10. Tutors will target students needs to increase standards mastery.

Person Responsible	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency has shown a significant decrease from the state assessments at 61% (FSA - 2019) to our progress monitoring tools during the 2019-2020 school year (PMA 38%).
Measureable Outcome:	The school plans to continue the work around math practices and regular instruction for students accessing word problems in the coming school year. Much of our decline is a result of student language and reading deficits. We will continue the work with our Math Coach to provide teachers the tools for math instruction. We will increase our Math scores on the state exam by 10% in the upcoming school year.
Monitoring:	Team plannings (90 minutes weekly) will be a focus on building math concepts through hands-on teaching. The use of concrete manipulatives and real-world problems will be closely monitored and tracked during walkthroughs and coaching cycles. Monitor the blended learning platforms for iReady (K-2), and Freckle (3-5) for fidelity and data usage.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Domingo (domingoa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	2nd - 5th: Continue to implement Athletics with flexible differentiated small groups. K-1: Increase standards-based instruction with hands-on learning and small group instruction. K-5: Align assessments (mastery checks) to standards-based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Acaletics has been proven successful in our Duval school's who piloted the program as well as schools in south Florida with large ELL populations. Students continue to struggle with basic Math skills and we would like to strengthen the foundation in K-1. The use on ongoing assessments to ensure progress monitoring and timely remediation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Acaletics training and continuous professional development throughout the year.(2-5)
2. Monthly progress monitoring of Acaletics to facilitate flexible groupings and individual data chats.
3. School-based professional development for hands-on and small group instruction. (K-1)
4. Use of gradual release model to ensure more frequent progress monitoring of standards. (i.e mastery checks, exit tickets)
5. Use Read, Draw, Write method at least once daily during core math lessons.
6. Use of CUBES as a school-wide strategy for word problems.

Person Responsible	Angela Domingo (domingoa@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will continue the work of implementing PBIS and becoming a PBIS Model School with the state of Florida.
Measureable Outcome:	We will be awarded the PBIS Model School accolade. We will continue to decrease our punitive consequences for students while increasing our positive response to behaviors observed and increasing positive rewards for desirable behaviors.
Monitoring:	We will monitor through the monthly reporting system and report out to the PBIS committee. We will disaggregate data to determine areas and personnel who are in need of support systems in order to be successful in implementing the school-wide plan.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charanda Reshard (reshardc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Working with our PBIS team to create a plan which will enable our staff to easily identify the behavior that is occurring and how to address it.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Since this process is only 1 year old at our school, we need to ensure we continue to monitor and find areas of improvement throughout the school year to ensure our PBIS plan is being implemented with fidelity by all stakeholders.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This data is collected through analysis from the previous 2 school years where the Standards Aligned Walkthrough Tool has been used as a measure of implementation for how instructional practices are being based on standards bases instruction. The first year of using the tool each of the three areas (Standards Focused Board, Instructional Delivery and Assessing Student Learning) were below the 2.0 measure, which indicates low implementation and low use of standards guiding instruction/assessment. In the 2020-2021 school year the area of focus was Standards Focused Board and Instructional Delivery. Each of those categories improved by over 1.0 point. This school year, the focus will be in continued growth for Instructional Delivery and improvement for Assessing Student Learning. The goal is to see improvements on all subject areas across all grade levels.
Measureable Outcome:	Our goal is to improve the alignment of Instructional Delivery including materials/content taught, student tasks to a consistent Yes, whereas we will average at least a 3.0 on the majority of the observations. For Assessing Student Learning the goal is to improve by 1.0 point by the end of the school year.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will continue to be done my administration weekly by completing at least 4 walkthroughs each. Debriefing and analysis of data will be completed in ILTs monthly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement strategies for increasing alignment to standards based instruction by intentionally planning lessons during our 90 minute common planning block, including completing Learning Arcs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The goal of completing the Learning Arcs and planning for each lesson is to ensure teachers share the full understanding of the language of the standards by way of discussion and implementation. Teachers will continue to receive guidance on the expectations for Instructional Delivery and Assessing Student Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our 5essential data, the area of most need is Teacher Collaboration and Teacher to Teacher Trust.
Measureable Outcome:	We will increase the ratings for Teacher Collaboration and Teacher to Teacher trust by at least 10 points in the 2021-2022 5 essential survey.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored throughout the school year through observation, in house survey and teacher panel conversations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This area of Focus is being improved by practices such as increased teacher collaboration times, teacher to teacher observation, opportunities for teacher leadership and PDs, opportunities for teachers to participate in each others' classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe if teachers see the work being done by others (especially other grade levels) they will understand the scope of work being done at the school.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

The report obtained through safeschoolsforalex.org is the report for the 2019-2020 school year. At the time our school ranked very high risk. The report states the school reports 2.12 incidents per 100 students. Our data for 2020-2021 school year reflects a very different picture and has shown great improvement with only 3 students receiving suspensions versus 13 the year before. None received more than 1 suspension and there is not an outlier demographic that appears to be targeted. We have since become a PBIS school and put in place protocols to improve school culture. We will use funds from Title I school wide plan to purchase office/classroom materials to aid in the delivery of classroom instruction. Storeroom order will be utilized for copy paper, supplies, classroom and student materials.
Our Supplemental workbooks and materials will target our most in-need population (low achieving readers and ELLs) to provide comprehensive vocabulary and language instruction. Our purchase of PD books will target a PLC for all staff members which will focus on improving instruction and school culture. We will utilize the instructional materials and supplies to aid the PLCs and provide opportunities for educators to engage in learning and collaboration.

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.

In the past school year, Englewood Elementary has developed a focused plan to address positive school culture for all stakeholders. We believe that it cannot begin and end with students as the adults in the building must be willing to be a part of the shift, and they cannot do so if the adult building culture is also not cultivated and in place. Through the work of the Instructional Leadership Team, we ensured that we celebrated staff monthly and created an environment of professionalism and respect for self and others. As the staff culture became solidified, we began to open dialogue on how to create a positive student and family culture as well.

This year we will continue our work by engaging in community conversations on how to best support our families and students within and out of our building. We will ensure through our agreed-upon protocols that students will be valued, respected, treated kindly, and recognized for their accomplishments. We will work on improving our community outreach so that families understand our work and feel valued and a part of our school community.

We will do this work led by our Administration team and PBIS committee.

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

Our Leadership Team is at the forefront of this culture shift:
Luisa Reis - Principal
Shelly Domingo - AP
Laurie Tilbrook - Reading Coach
Melissa Goodman - Math Coach
Catherine Baucom - ELD Coach
Charanda Reshard - School Counselor
Megan Nosowicz - Teacher / PBIS trainee
Grade Level PBIS representative

Part V: Budget

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: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00