

Duval County Public Schools

Arlington Heights 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	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Arlington Heights Elementary School

1520 SPRINKLE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

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

Demographics

Principal: Katrice Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (34%) 2014-15: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan 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	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Arlington Heights Elementary School

1520 SPRINKLE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

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

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

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

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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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
White, Nikesha	Assistant Principal	Ensures the highest academic standards and a safe and secure learning environment for all students. Leads, manages, supervises, and administers all programs, policies and activities of the school. Monitors instruction, ensures implementation of district curriculum and assesses effectiveness of instructional and support personnel.

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	46	53	36	55	49	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	9	17	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	17	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	16	19	17	23	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	

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	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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)

17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

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	20	22	25	20	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	2	6	11	5	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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	6	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	16	32	36	43	43	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199

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	39%	50%	57%	33%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	53%	60%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	63%	39%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	63%	62%	33%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	48%	53%	20%	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	46 (0)	53 (0)	36 (0)	55 (0)	49 (0)	67 (0)	306 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	17 ()	16 ()	9 ()	17 ()	15 ()	16 ()	90 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	1 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	15 (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)	17 (0)	14 (0)	25 (0)	56 (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	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
	2018	20%	50%	-30%	57%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	35%	50%	-15%	56%	-21%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		31%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
05	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	49%	-12%	53%	-16%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
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	19	41	29	35	56	56	29				
ELL	27	44		62	65		15				
BLK	38	50	40	61	73	59	44				
HSP	39	58		74	80		27				
WHT	38	52		59	91		55				
FRL	43	56	42	65	76	62	47				
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	16	47		26	41						
ELL	7	44	47	31	48	45					
BLK	22	44	50	35	43	54	31				
HSP	36	56		47	36		73				
WHT	42	50		65	66		64				
FRL	32	50	43	45	52	50	50				

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	7	53	55	17	24						
ELL	7	55		31	32		10				
BLK	31	61	67	32	34	38	21				
HSP	29	54		41	19		13				
WHT	41	52		45	39		21				
FRL	33	57	57	39	34	41	18				

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	56
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	
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	52
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	56
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	59
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	58
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 Students With Disabilities showed the lowest performance and is an area of focus. In 2018-2019, we had 19% scoring a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA assessment. This is an increase from 16% proficient in 2017-2018. This subgroup has historically performed lower than any other group at the school. A major contributing factor is the below grade level reading for these students. On the FSA Math assessment, the same group of students showed an increase from 26% in 2017-2018 to 35% in 2018-2019.

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

We saw a decline in ELA learning gains for our SWD from 47% in 2017-2018 to 41% in 2018-2019. Additionally, our learning gains from our bottom quartile students' declined from 48% in 2017-2018 to 36% in 2018-2019. Historically, these students display reading deficits and they require more intensive reading instruction.

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.

Reviewing grade level raw data in comparison to the state's average, the greatest gap is in ELA for all grade levels. In 3rd grade, the school state comparison is -19%, 4th grade is -20% and 5th grade is -21%. Our school achievement for ELA has improved but the increases are small. This school year teachers received professional development on deepen their understanding of standards based instruction and planning standards-based lessons with the reading and math coaches. This was common practice this year during common planning. Common planning has been consistent over the past few years but the focus on standards based instruction was a priority this year.

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

Our math data for all grade levels showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019. In 3rd grade, we increased 31%, 4th grade increased 26% and 5th grade increased 1%. The school-state comparison for this year was 5% for 3rd and 4th but -8% for 5th. The increases moved us closer to the state's average for 3rd and 4th but not for 5th grade math. This year all 3rd-5th grade students were involved in Acaletics for 30 minutes a day. Monthly scrimmages were administered to the students and this data was monitored by administration and coaches. During common planning, teachers planned lessons with the math coach and really differentiated tasks for students.

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

For the upcoming school year, we will focus on improving attendance for all students. The leadership team will start the year with those students who had chronic absences in the prior school year. Each team member will be assigned a grade level and they will monitor those students as well as any other students who may exhibit attendance issues. The leadership team will report absences to the principal weekly and this team will meet monthly to discuss next steps.

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

1. Continue planning reading and math standards based instruction in K-5 classrooms.
2. Ensure our SWD students are receiving scaffolding core instruction so they can successfully participate in grade level instruction.
3. Implement interventions and monitor students who were referred to the AIT from school year 2018-2019.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on our data, our most critical area of focus is our reading and math performance for our students with disabilities.
Rationale	Historically our Students With disabilities have consistently performed lower than other subgroups in reading and math. Last year, SWD reading proficiency performance increased 3% from the 2017-18 school year and an increase of 9% in math. This was an improvement for this subgroup in reading and math but a greater increase in achievement can be obtained with these student. With guidance from administration, the reading and math coaches will provide professional development to teachers on the use of various instructional resources and on evidenced-based practices that accelerate student learning. Additionally, students will participate in field experiences that will help increase their understand of the standards being introduced.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our Students with Disabilities will show a 25% increase in reading and math proficiency based on the FSA. Student progress towards this goal will be monitored using various data sets. For reading, checks for understanding, corrective reading mastery test, standards mastery test and iReady growth will be tracked. The same assessments will be monitored for math with the addition of Acaletics monthly scrimmage data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nikesha White (fishern@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our Reading and Math Coaches will provide professional development on scaffolding core instruction using the KUDS (Know, Understand, Do, Strategy) and DOK tasks when planning reading and math lessons during weekly common planning sessions. All K-5, including VE teachers, will participate and collaborate in the planning sessions. A dedicated paraprofessional will provide additional intensive small group reading instruction for our SWD and our lower performing students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This year our SWD participated in small group instruction with the VE teacher for reading and math. Based on the FSA data, iReady growth checks, and Acaletics scrimmages, progress was made but at times it was inconsistent. Small group instruction was consistent throughout the school year.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After initial baseline test, create small groups and assign to a dedicated paraprofessional for intensive reading instruction. 2. Reading and math coaches will facilitate common planning sessions that will focus on unpacking the standards, task alignment and student ownership. 3. Student work and data will be reviewed during common planning and plans for next steps determined. 4. Repeat the process for each standard for reading and math. 5.
Person Responsible	Nikesha White (fishern@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 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.

See PFEP

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.

See PFEP

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

See PFEP

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.

See PFEP

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

See PFEP

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on our data, our most critical area of focus is our reading and math performance for our students with disabilities.				\$148,825.75
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2401 - Arlington Heights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	\$94,965.00
			<i>Notes: salary for reading and math coaches</i>			
	6400	200-Employee Benefits	2401 - Arlington Heights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.0	\$35,327.00
			<i>Notes: Benefits for reading and math coaches</i>			
	5100	390-Other Purchased Services	2401 - Arlington Heights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Field experiences for students</i>			
	7800	390-Other Purchased Services	2401 - Arlington Heights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Transportation for students to attend field experiences</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	2401 - Arlington Heights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$14,033.75
			<i>Notes: SUPPLY FUNDS MOVED TO HOLDING AREA 5100/334 \$12437.87 for Acaletics math and \$1595.88 for Science materials placed in 5100/510 supplies.</i>			
Total:						\$148,825.75