

Duval County Public Schools

# Chaffee Trail Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

## Chaffee Trail Elementary

11400 SAM CARUSO WAY, Jacksonville, FL 32221

<http://www.duvalschools.org/chaffee-trail>

### Demographics

**Principal: Casie Doyle L**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

## Chaffee Trail Elementary

11400 SAM CARUSO WAY, Jacksonville, FL 32221

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

### 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	Yes	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	C

### 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.

To Provide the basis for all students to become life long learners and well rounded ciitzens

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage all students in menaingful work, Empower them to become responsible for their own learning, So that they Excell as productive citizens.

### 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
Doyle, Casie	Principal	
Wright, Marquita	Assistant Principal	
Sherman, Katherine	School Counselor	
Slawson, Shauna	Teacher, ESE	

### 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	119	116	118	132	117	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	16	14	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	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	0	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

38

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/19/2019

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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	53%	50%	57%	54%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	62%	63%	63%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	63%	62%	65%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	51%	58%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	48%	53%	62%	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	119 (0)	116 (0)	118 (0)	132 (0)	117 (0)	120 (0)	722 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ( )	14 ( )	16 ( )	14 ( )	12 ( )	14 ( )	75 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 ( )	1 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	13 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	13 (0)	20 (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	47%	51%	-4%	58%	-11%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	54%	49%	5%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	64%	13%	64%	13%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	67%	57%	10%	60%	7%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	49%	11%	53%	7%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	30	50	47	45	50	59	35				
ELL	33	30		42	50						
BLK	43	50	45	61	61	52	43				
HSP	36	31		56	62						
MUL	61	67		72	73						
WHT	67	59	67	81	75	73	76				
FRL	49	56	48	65	59	53	58				
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	30	45	40	41	63	67	33				
ASN	80	60		90	90						
BLK	43	46	33	61	77	73	37				
HSP	57	90		67	55						
MUL	64	63		60	69		70				
WHT	62	57	50	82	75	70	71				
FRL	48	52	46	63	69	63	48				

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	22	44	38	33	53	48	35				
ASN	60			70							
BLK	45	53	48	52	62	67	53				
HSP	33	46		58	57						
MUL	56	53		79	81						
WHT	62	62	55	69	67	56	71				
FRL	45	51	44	55	57	60	50				

### 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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	46
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
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	55
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.**

Over all reading proficiency -  
growing number of students with disabilities and meeting their individual needs in teacher and VE small groups is difficult when the group has such varying levels of support needs. Additional training for k-5 in the foundations of reading and how to help a struggling reader with multi sensory programs

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

over all reading gains - a years worth growth for every child  
growing number of students with disabilities and meeting their individual needs in teacher and VE small groups is difficult when the group has such varying levels of support needs. Additional training for k-5 in the foundations of reading and how to help a struggling reader with multi sensory programs

**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.**

ESOL students reading scores. This small group of students are often moving from school to school in the state of Florida and even within our own county. This movement sometimes benefits them when they enroll in a school with ESOL para's and teachers. While our teachers are ESOL certified they do not have true learning opportunities for continued PD on how to meet the students varying needs.

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

Reading Bottom Quartile - Title I funded supports that included - small group LLI instruction before and after school. In School Barton Tutors and Reading Phonics/Saxon supports, Lunch and Learn groups for science, reading and math mentoring. ALL TITLE I funded

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

Students who need behavior supports - increased referrals and suspensions

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

1. Over all reading proficiency
2. Bottom quartile growth in Math and Reading
3. Social Emotional Learning supports for all students and additional training for students needing increased behaviors supports
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Reading Lowest quartile students performing 1.5 years below grade level
<b>Rationale</b>	Less than 50% of Students in CTES lowest quartile reading made a year's growth.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	60% of Students in lowest quartile will make a year's growth in reading according to FSA and Iready(k-2)
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Teacher led small groups with fidelity using evidence based programs specific to the students needs as defined by their Iready, achieve, teacher made assessment for placement and needs. Teachers in grades k and 1 will use SIPS, teachers in grade 3 will use LLI, Corrective reading, or Bartons depending on their needs.</p> <p>Leveled Literacy Intervention is a scientifically-based program that works with struggling readers so they are able to reach the level they need to be on. The program is fast paced and provides students with comprehension, fluency, writing, phonics, &amp; vocabulary throughout each lesson.</p> <p>Corrective Reading is a powerful Direct Instruction remedial reading series that solves a wide range of problems for struggling older readers, even if they have failed with other approaches. Explicit, step-by-step lessons are organized around two major strands, Decoding and Comprehension, which may be used separately or together to customize instruction for particular student needs. Each strand of Corrective Reading has four levels that teach foundation skills for non-readers to seventh-grade-level material – potentially all in about 2 1/2 years.</p> <p>SIPPS offers a systematic approach to decoding that supports students in grades K–12 in developing reading fluency and comprehension. For students who struggle with decoding, SIPPS can be used to accelerate students to grade level quickly. Each SIPPS level corresponds to one level in a developmental progression: simple alphabetic, spelling pattern, and polysyllabic/morphemic phases. Daily SIPPS lessons and reading practice in appropriate texts engage students in their own reading processes.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Train Leadership team on progress monitoring tool</li> <li>2. Train teachers on day to day implementation of programs</li> <li>3. Train team on how to screen for levels in programs</li> <li>4. Monitor progress of students</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase over all k-5 reading proficiency.
<b>Rationale</b>	Schools reading proficiency is less than 52%
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	More than 60% will be proficient in reading in the 2019-20 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1.
	2.
	3.
	4.
	5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]
<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Social Emotional well being of students
<b>Rationale</b>	Increase in class 2 referrals for the 2018-19 school years by 40%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Decrease the number of students written on class 1 and 2 referrals that require out of class consequences by 50%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Marquita Wright (wrightm3@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We will provide for social and emotional lessons(Sanford Harmony) and games within our weekly/daily schedules with fidelity.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Sanford Harmony is a CASEL SElect program, aligned to the five core SEL competencies from The Collaborative to Advance Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL), the nation's top evaluator of SEL evidence-based programs. SEL interventions that address CASEL's five core competencies like the Sanford Harmony program have been shown to increase students' academic performance by 13%.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Review referral data with staff/faculty
	2. provide PD on Sanford Harmony in PLC's
	3. Monitor progress via classroom rounding, walk throughs, etc.
	4.
	5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Marquita Wright (wrightm3@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).

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Lowest quartile students performing 1.5 years below grade level	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase over all k-5 reading proficiency.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social Emotional well being of students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00