

Duval County Public Schools

Greenland Pines Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Greenland Pines Elementary School

5050 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

Demographics

Principal: Michele Hinkley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	58%
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 (64%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (65%) 2014-15: A (67%)
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

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

Greenland Pines Elementary School

5050 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

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

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	33%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

Greenland Pines Elementary School will be a school where everyone works together to create a positive, safe environment, where all student can meet the standards through rigorous, hands-on learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenland Pines Elementary School will be a school where everyone works together to create a positive, safe environment, where all student can meet the standards through rigorous, hands-on learning.

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
Walker, Beverly	Principal	
Reis, Luisa	Assistant Principal	
Ravula, Sruthika	Instructional Coach	

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	106	102	133	98	90	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	631
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

49

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

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	65%	50%	57%	68%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	56%	58%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	39%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	62%	63%	72%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	48%	53%	66%	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	106 (0)	102 (0)	133 (0)	98 (0)	90 (0)	102 (0)	631 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	2 ()	3 ()	0 ()	6 (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)	4 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	16 (0)	18 (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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
	2018	63%	50%	13%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	74%	50%	24%	56%	18%
	2018	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
	2018	73%	59%	14%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
	2018	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	76%	57%	19%	60%	16%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
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	29	44	46	39	49	41	43				
ELL	50			58							
ASN	75	64		88	86		83				
BLK	49	50	36	53	53	45	38				
HSP	42	69		46	54						
MUL	57	47		71	60						
WHT	72	74	68	79	70	54	87				
FRL	54	67	57	57	56	40	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	27	29	31	38	51	54	25				
ELL	35	43		35	50						
ASN	76	74		84	65		70				
BLK	48	48		62	50	70	60				
HSP	39	29		39	52	40	33				
MUL	60	65		67	71						

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
WHT	63	59	32	72	59	47	62				
FRL	46	51	33	57	56	51	54				
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	26	29	28	37	47	35	36				
ELL	38	58		56	55						
ASN	71	53		82	74						
BLK	61	57		55	52						
HSP	55	50		52	35						
MUL	67	69		74	54						
WHT	70	55	39	74	63	44	67				
FRL	56	51	44	63	54	23	48				

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	64
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	57
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	79
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	46
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	53
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	59
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	72
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	56
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.

Our subgroup demonstrating the lowest performance is our Students with Disabilities at 29% proficiency in ELA. Students achievement increased from the prior year, yet still are demonstrating a slow pace of improvement. Our high number of SWD contribute to this low achievement average and we will continue to work with our teachers to provide supports for each student.

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

Our population section which had the greatest decline was our Lowest Performing Quartile Black students achieving Math Gains. The loss of the school's instructional coach was a factor for this decline. The lack of district content support also contributed to this loss.

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 only component which was lower than the state average was our Lowest Performing Quartile in Math. The loss of the school's instructional coach was a factor for this decline. The lack of district content support also contributed to this loss.

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

The section of our data that demonstrated the most improvement was our White students performing at the Lowest Performing Quartile. We see this increase attributed to the work that was done within the grade levels in small groups and the focus by tutors in the ELA instruction.

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 which we will maintain close monitoring will be 16 of our current 5th-grade students who score a level 1 on their 4th grade FSA (Math and/or ELA)

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

1. Math LPQ LG
2. ELA Achievement for SWD
3. Black student subgroup ELA LPQ LG
4. Implement Restorative Justice Practices
5. Facilitate opportunities for activities to improve teacher-to-teacher trust

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Differentiated and Standards Aligned Instruction
Rationale	If all teachers provide differentiated tiered instruction directly aligned to student data, then student achievement will increase for all students, including our Lowest Performing Quartile.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will monitor the progress of our LPQ in both Math and ELA weekly for usage and student passing rates. Teacher small group documentation will be used in data-chats to monitor progress and identify other needs. Quarterly PMAs will be used to track growth and used by classroom teachers to tier and provide needs-based small group instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Beverly Walker (walkerb2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional development will be done with teachers focused on standards-based tiered instruction. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the quality and fidelity of tiered instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The above strategies have been selected through the evidence presented in last year's data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with teachers monthly for data-chats 2. Provide in-house and district opportunities for PD 3. Create a culture of Instruction where the administration is frequently in classrooms 4. Work with lowest-performing teachers to support tiered instruction
Person Responsible	Beverly Walker (walkerb2@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	School Culture and Climate w/ focus on trust
Rationale	Through the data from the 5essentials survey, the teacher-to-teacher trust was the lowest placed category on the survey.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The administration will begin by facilitating activities such as team building during pre-planning as a step for building teacher trust. Each teacher team (grade level/subject/resource) will be encouraged to develop an activity to be done as a whole group during 1 of the monthly faculty meetings. The idea will be for teams to create opportunities to build relationships.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Luisa Reis (reisl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Schools with higher culture and climate ratings tend to work efficiently to solve problems that may arise in the school including how to best serve students and families and how to support each other professionally through modeling of excellent instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If the school is able to have a solid teacher to teacher trust, they will more consistently be able to support each other and students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a plan for team building activities 2. Facilitate a model activity for staff 3. Provide opportunities for relationship building and professional discourse 4. Debrief after activities to check in on the efficacy
Person Responsible	Luisa Reis (reisl@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).

NA