Bartram Springs Elementary

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bartram Springs Elementary

14799 BARTRAM SPRINGS PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32258

http://www.duvalschools.org/bartramsprings

Demographics

Principal: Kimberley Wright

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

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)	40%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (72%) 2014-15: A (80%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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

Bartram Springs Elementary

14799 BARTRAM SPRINGS PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32258

http://www.duvalschools.org/bartramsprings

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	24%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Bartram Springs Elementary will SOAR to attain educational excellence by providing a:
-Safe and Nurturing Environment
-Opportunities for Character Building
-Academic Success through Rigorous Instruction
-Relationships with the Community

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students are inspired to achieve personal and academic success.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wright, Kimberley	Principal	Oversee the School Leadership Team. The principal will share student data and lead the team in data analysis as well as problem solving. The team will work together to develop goals and strategies to improve student achievement. The team consists of representation from each grade level.
Bartley, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	
Bradley, Stacy	Assistant Principal	
Dortch, Tatiana	Teacher, K-12	
Pierre, Danay	Teacher, K-12	
Walsh, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	
Weaks, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	
Virgil, Jaclyn	Teacher, ESE	
Ray , Cindy	Teacher, K-12	
Janiszewski, Megan	Teacher, K-12	

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	188	195	156	145	149	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	968
Attendance below 90 percent	26	10	12	9	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	18	48	32	54	49	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	15	17	19	10	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
50

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	32	22	19	15	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	8	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	24	33	34	69	85	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320

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	10	11	11	25	32	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	78%	50%	57%	77%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	56%	58%	72%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	50%	53%	56%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	62%	63%	87%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	63%	62%	80%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	51%	74%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	48%	53%	79%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	188 (0)	195 (0)	156 (0)	145 (0)	149 (0)	135 (0)	968 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	26 ()	10 ()	12 ()	9 ()	14 ()	12 ()	83 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	3 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 ()	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	18 ()	48 (0)	32 (0)	54 (0)	49 (0)	48 (0)	249 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	76%	51%	25%	58%	18%	
	2018	75%	50%	25%	57%	18%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%	
	2018	73%	49%	24%	56%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					
05	2019	73%	50%	23%	56%	17%	
	2018	75%	51%	24%	55%	20%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%	
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	70%	64%	6%	64%	6%	
	2018	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-11%					
Cohort Comparison		-10%					
05	2019	83%	57%	26%	60%	23%	
	2018	83%	61%	22%	61%	22%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%	
	2018	77%	56%	21%	55%	22%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	60	66	56	62	63	52	45				

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
ELL	71	71		75	61						
ASN	86	79		93	72		88				
BLK	68	61	37	71	67	50	45				
HSP	81	72		87	69		73				
MUL	76	70		79	81		73				
WHT	80	78	70	83	75	59	85				
FRL	71	70	48	78	76	56	73				
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	48	47	24	57	57	44	45				
ELL	64	75	70	77	75						
ASN	87	80		91	83		88				
BLK	65	56	38	72	58	38	59				
HSP	82	81		87	70		95				
MUL	80	67		83	71						
WHT	78	66	47	87	80	80	81				
FRL	72	68	57	81	73	60	74				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	49	36	29	51	50	47	62				
ELL	71	80		76	100						
ASN	83	75		98	88		100				
BLK	63	63	39	79	73	67	67				
HSP	86	79		92	88	93	83				
MUL	72	71		87	80		70				
WHT	78	71	58	86	79	71	78				
FRL	72	71	67	84	79	76	71				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	70
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	67
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

The lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance in Math. Based on our FSA data from 2018 to 2019, our students demonstrated a decrease by 12%. Many of the students in the lowest quartile are ESE and did not demonstrate a year's growth.

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

The lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline. Many students within this group lack important foundational skills resulting in academic gaps. The lack of differentiated instruction, targeting foundational skills to bridge those gaps and meeting the needs of individual students contributed to this factor.

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.

We exceeded the state average in 5 out of the 7 accountability components. Our lowest performing quartile decreased from 57% to 53% in ELA. Our lowest performing quartile decreased from 54% to 51% in Math.

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

Our learning gains in ELA demonstrated the most improvement. Our gains increased from 67% to 73%. After analysis of student data, our teachers used Tier 2 resources such the Ready LAFS Teacher Toolkit, Phonics for Reading and REWARDS to remediate skills with students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One area of concern is students with two or more Early Warning indicators. Our data shows 15 students in 1st grade, 17 students in 2nd grade, 19 students in 3rd grade, 10 students in 4th grade and 27 students in 5th grade. This gives us an overall total of 88 students with two or more Early Warning indicators.

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

1. Increase Math Proficiency.
2. Increase Overall Learning Gains as well as Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile.
3. Increase Science Proficiency.
4. Increase achievement for our subgroups: SWD, ELL and African American students.
5. Decrease the number of lower level confrontations from the previous year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Math Proficiency, Overall Math Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for our Lowest 25%.
Rationale	Based on our 2019 FSA data, our students demonstrated a decrease in Math proficiency as well as learning gains. Our proficiency rate decreased from 85% to 81%. Our overall math learning gains decreased from 74% to 73%. Our math learning gains for our lowest 25% decreased from 66% to 54%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers provide targeted, data-driven instruction along with the appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, we will increase proficiency in Math from 81% to 83% as well as increasing learning gains for our lowest 25% from 54% to 58%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use resources such as Eureka Math, the Ready Teacher Toolkit and any additional evidence- based materials to remediate foundational skills to increase student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students with gaps in their math foundational skills are less likely to demonstrate one year's growth as measured on the FSA Math assessment. These students need targeted intervention taught through small group instruction or one-on-one instruction to remediate their skills.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will analyze the previous year's (2018-19) and beginning of the year baseline data to identify students in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 support. 2. Teachers will group students based on their needs. 3. Teachers will remediate foundational skills through small group instruction before, during and/or after school. 4. Teachers will receive training on Thinking Maps (Brain-based strategies and activities). 5. The principal will research and purchase Number Worlds,an intervention based resource for Math
Person Responsible	Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

As an additional area of focus, we will focus on decreasing the Code of Conduct offense, lower level confrontations from the previous year. In 2018-19, we had 64 offenses in this area. Our goal for 2019-20, is to decrease this number by 10%. Using Sanford Harmony, classroom teachers and school counselors will provide Social Emotional Learning lessons to students throughout the school year.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Proficiency, Overall Math Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for our Lowest 25%.				$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1611 - Bartram Springs Elementary	School Improvement Funds	1002.0	$6,000.00
			Notes: Purchase Number Worlds intervention materials. Fund Thinking Maps Professional Development training for teachers.			
					Total:	$6,000.00