

Duval County Public Schools

Englewood High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Englewood High School

4412 BARNES RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

Demographics

Principal: Marleny Ch IR Ino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	92%
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: C (50%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: C (48%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Englewood High School

4412 BARNES RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">88%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">74%</p>

School Grades History

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

Our MISSION at Englewood High School is to maintain a culturally diverse community of students, parents and staff, dedicated to creating a highly successful educational environment in which each student is empowered to reach his or her full academic, social and emotional potential in every class, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our VISION at Englewood High School is to nurture and celebrate a culturally diverse environment highly regarded for its educational excellence, preparing all students for a successful transition into a collegiate journey or career path.

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
Bravo, Sara	Principal	Oversight of all Accountability Areas Direct Liaison to Biology
Johnson, Stacey	Assistant Principal	Administrative Liaison for Math
Chirino, Marleny	Assistant Principal	Administrative Liaison over ELA/Reading
Buckner, Al	Assistant Principal	Administrative Liaison over US History
Boyd, Chanthony	Dean	Oversight of PBIS and Discipline
Piattono-Martin, Ana	Dean	Oversight of Attendance Support and Discipline
Wrye, Sue	Instructional Coach	Support of Teachers and Targeted Students to improve reading growth and proficiency school-wide
Williams, June		
Smith, Cassandra	Instructional Coach	
Bergeron, Nicole	Instructional Coach	
Martinez, Jennifer	Other	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559	536	469	384	1948
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	101	83	64	341
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	37	76	40	10	163
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	285	155	208	83	731

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	0	0	0	0	0	18	42	38	98
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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

94

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	176	179	156	161	672
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	14	9	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	67	35	7	160
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	265	292	363	268	1188

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	307	289	222	218	1036

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	32%	47%	56%	30%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	48%	51%	34%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	42%	42%	28%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	39%	51%	51%	60%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	52%	48%	65%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	45%	55%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	49%	65%	68%	51%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	55%	70%	73%	56%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	559 (0)	536 (0)	469 (0)	384 (0)	1948 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	93 ()	101 ()	83 ()	64 ()	341 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	37 (0)	76 (0)	40 (0)	10 (0)	163 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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
09	2019	29%	48%	-19%	55%	-26%
	2018	24%	48%	-24%	53%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	29%	48%	-19%	53%	-24%
	2018	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	67%	-20%	67%	-20%
2018	46%	63%	-17%	65%	-19%
Compare		1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	68%	-18%	70%	-20%
2018	49%	64%	-15%	68%	-19%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	57%	-32%	61%	-36%
2018	23%	61%	-38%	62%	-39%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	61%	-14%	57%	-10%
2018	33%	57%	-24%	56%	-23%
Compare		14%			

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	12	31	38	23	46		41	38		97	33
ELL	9	30	26	25	36	38	24	27		86	68
ASN	36	34	22	51	57		44	53		90	65
BLK	28	40	42	32	49	32	46	53		92	52
HSP	25	41	31	37	42	32	47	41		88	67
MUL	47	58		31	47		54	57		100	62
WHT	41	44	37	48	67	81	58	72		93	63
FRL	28	40	34	36	46	39	49	49		90	54

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	15	25	21	20	57		30	38		79	30
ELL	3	31	29	21	55	30	19	20		87	75
ASN	22	36	20	49	70		52	56		97	77
BLK	26	37	30	30	54	35	41	42		85	51
HSP	23	39	36	30	63	44	51	53		82	74
MUL	42	42		50				62		60	
WHT	40	39	23	36	59	40	59	66		88	63
FRL	28	37	33	32	58	29	46	53		82	58

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	14	26	27	54	50		28	36		59	85
ELL	7	26	24	52	72	67	31	25		82	71
ASN	29	28	18	52	67		39	53		79	95
BLK	27	32	34	56	63	59	38	50		84	64
HSP	26	34	26	64	69	30	47	34		84	75
MUL	46	39		50			67			90	

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
WHT	34	38	24	66	68		70	77		81	74
FRL	27	32	27	55	63	51	45	50		86	72

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	50
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	550
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	38
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	49
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
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	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	57
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	60
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	46
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.

Algebra 1 showed the lowest performance in proficiency at 25%.

The trend: students coming from Algebra 1A are historically non-proficient and continue to be about 75% of the test takers for the Algebra 1 denominator. For example, in 18.19 the total denominator of Algebra 1 testers was 355. Of those students only 76 were proficient the year prior on the 8th grade FSA. It continues to be a challenge to build the capacity of the Algebra 1A student.

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

The largest decline was in the Overall Growth for Math. It dropped from 60% to 51%. The decline was due to a population of 25 Algebra 1 Honors students that had a teacher leave mid year. Of that population only 2 of the 25 made their yearly growth from the 8th Grade Math FSA to the Algebra 1 FSA.

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.

When comparing to the state average using Federal Index data, our greatest gap fell into two subgroups- students with disabilities and ELL students.

Trends:

- Steadily growing sheltered ESOL population
- Steadily growing population of students with disabilities from transfer students and incoming 9th graders

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

The area that showed the greatest improvement was Geometry with a rise of 14% in proficiency.

New Actions in this area:

- Teacher placement / Teacher capacity
- Shifts in curriculum choices
- Use of SAS data dashboard to identify specific students for interventions

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

When reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1 (D), the are of concern would be that each grade level has 15-18% of students that are below 90% for attendance.

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

1. Algebra 1 LPQ and Gains
2. ELA 9th/10th LPQ and Gains
3. Student Attendance
4. Continued positive behavioral solutions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Growth and LPQ Growth in Mathematics (specifically Algebra)
Rationale	While our proficiency and LPQ improved in math as a whole, Geometry carried these areas. Algebra as an isolated content increased by 2 proficiency points, but we lost ground with our Algebra students in Growth and LPQ. With the LPQ students consistently identified and a double-blocked model with our "triple bucket" students, it is unacceptable for Englewood to lose any of these students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Target percentages for 2019-2020: 55% Growth 50% LPQ Growth" Total Number of Students: 80 Growth Total ___ LPQ Total **Will complete once students are determined after week 1 of school</p> <p>Number of Targeted Students: 44 Total 34 level 3s 10 Level 4s and 5s LPQ _____ ** Will be completed after this population is identified</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacey Johnson (tuttles1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>"Of the total 80 Growth Algebra 1 Students, there are 61 Level 3s that will be double blocked with Mr. Fitch. A teacher change was made from last year based on data. 19 of the 80 Growth students will be in Algebra 1 Honors and are Level 4s and 5s. They will be taught by Mr. Artavia and co-taught by math coach to ensure rigor throughout the year as this was an area where we dropped the previous year due to inconsistent rigor and a teacher leaving prior to State EOC.</p> <p>34/61- Fitch Goal 10/19- Artavia Goal 44/80 for a Goal of 55% Growth for Algebra 1 *LPQ target number will be determined using SAS when available; goal for LPQ Growth is 50% **At the close of Semester 1, students (not seniors) who are missing more than 10 days and/or are scoring below 40+ on the 2nd 9 weeks assessment will be considered for removal from Algebra 1 and placed into Algebra 1A or MCR. "</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Teacher changes are a huge piece of our strategy puzzle this year for Algebra. The two positions most greatly impacting student growth and LPQ growth in Algebra have both been filled by different instructors who are historically more consistent, coach-able and data-driven than the previous instructors. The changes were not about content-knowledge or ability as much as about consistency.</p> <p>With these teacher changes comes the need for more teacher support. The Title 1 funded math coach position is crucial to the success of the students in these classrooms in regards to the teacher support and the interventions identified for our targeted Growth and LPQ students.</p> <p>In order to double-block all level 3 Algebra students and half of the level 2 Algebra</p>

students, a Title 1 funded math teacher is necessary to meet the goals set for Algebra in 2019-2020.

Action Step

1. Weekly PLC with a focus on Standard Breakdown from Common Assessments and teacher made skill based Exit Slips and remediation in double blocked classes
2. Spiral Review with the use of Standard Mastery Sheets from Math Nation and DCPS to demonstrate what standards/students are demonstrating mastery
3. Use of the following sources of data to determine ongoing instructional decision-making, student grouping, and shifts in targeted populations:

Description

- Quarterly PMA Assessment Data
- Weekly Common Exit Slip Data
- Lexile/ Achieve Data along with a focus on reading strategies/vocabulary
- 4. Pull outs and Push Ins with Math Coach focusing on targeted Growth and LPQ Algebra students
- 5. Use of technology-based platforms - MathNation, Khan Academy and iReady to provide both remediation and acceleration paths for students in classes and at home.

Person

Responsible

Stacey Johnson (tuttles1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Growth and LPQ Growth in ELA (both 9 and 10)
Rationale	<p>In reviewing the trend in data for Englewood High School the last three years, we noted a fluctuation in Learning Gains and Lowest Performing Quartile Gains (LPQ). Hiring a Reading Interventionist, through Title I, has allowed us to hone in further on student data, as it relates to strand performance, scale score, student dynamics, early warning indicators, and skill deficiencies. The Reading Interventionist, teachers, and content area Administrator work to desegregate the data and determine the support needed as they relate to groups of students and on an individual basis. Further, specific resources and curriculum are used by the Reading Interventionist that build on the skills needed, according to Achievement Level Indicators, to establish growth. Throughout the school year, students complete district and school assessments to monitor progress. The Reading Interventionist tracks this progress to re-evaluate the needs of students and adjust the groups and support accordingly. Support consists of push-ins or pull-outs; push-ins allow for scaffolding, while ensuring that grade level content is available. Pull-outs consist of smaller groups in a private setting to support skills. Through this process, we were able to see a 4% lift in our Learning Gains during the 2018-2019 school year and a 2% lift in our LPQ. Having a Reading Interventionist that is knowledgeable of content, curriculum, resources, etc., allows our school the opportunity to build grade-level readers and/or promote growth in literacy, in addition to assisting teachers in offering differentiation and small group instruction to all students.</p> <p>We have also hired an additional person to teach reading strategies, use informational text, and provide discourse opportunities through courses Debate 1 and 2. Students that are in our lower performing quartile are strategically scheduled into these courses for support with these items.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Overall Growth Goal: 45% (+3) Overall LPQ Growth Goal: 37% (+3) " Total Number of Students: 460/1024 (Gains) Total Number of Students: 71/190 (LPQ)"</p> <p>Targeted Students all of whom will be served directed by the Reading Interventionist:</p> <p>96 (10th Grade) - L. Gains 154 (9th Grade)- L. Gains</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>**Analyze Early Warning Indicators (attendance, behavior, social/emotional, etc.) and focus on 22 students (10th) that have scored a 3, 4, or 5, along with three years of gains and dropped during the 2018-2019 school year.</p> <p>*Achieve3000 will be monitored monthly for growth. Students between an 850-1000 Lexile that did not make growth previous year will be pulled out by Reading Interventionist to focus on skills/standards with grade level text.</p> <p>*42 target students in the 1819 & 106 target students in the 1920 cohort will be provided push-in/pull-out support. Using FSA grade level scale score, these students are at risk for proficiency and growth. Strand data will be reviewed for each of these students to focus on areas for opportunities.</p> <p>*48 target rising 9th graders that close to achieving growth by obtaining a 1.3 Level bucket.</p>

*9th Grade: Ms. Knighton will now be working with our Level 2's. Level 2's have stronger stamina with reading, but require intense support with skills/standard instruction to reach the core of deficiency. Ms. Cruz and Ms. Platte will work with our Level 1 students and utilize FAIR, Achieve, and Assessment data to provide correction instruction.

*10th Grade: Ms. Lovell will move up 40 students that made growth with her in the prior year.

*Continue adapting the curriculum, as we did in 1819, to include opportunities for students to connect a fictional, non-fictional, and poetic pieces, along with listening opportunities. "

*Debate 1 and 2 by Ms. Rice- students from lower performing quartile will be scheduled into these classes to be provided help with reading strategies, informational text, and discourse opportunities.

*Lower performing quartile students that are also ELL will be scheduled with a bilingual teacher, Mr. Emmanuelli, that supports instruction through dual language. Through this science course students will be provided instruction that includes reading strategies and English language support.

The ability to access EWI through SAS has greatly improved our ability to identify students in crisis early. Removing non-academic barriers is crucial to improving student performance in school.

Achieve 3000 is a critical tool used regularly by our Reading Interventionist. While not directly aligned to standards, it is an excellent tool for capturing growth or decline in comprehension skills and used to identify and intervene.

Push In and Pull Out strategies are used with targeted students and the majority of this work is done by the Reading Interventionist, a position funded by Title 1.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

1. Weekly PLC with a focus on the use of data to make instructional decisions and drive improvement.
2. Use of the following sources of data to determine ongoing instructional decision-making, student grouping, and shifts in targeted populations:
 Quarterly PMA Assessment Data
 FAIR Reading Data
 Lexile/ Achieve Data
4. Pull outs and Push Ins with Reading Interventionist focusing on targeted Growth and LPQ ELA students
5. Strategic and differentiated use of technology platforms - Achieve 3000 and Actively Learn to provide various learning paths for students at all levels of literacy proficiency.
6. Strategic scheduling with support electives (such as debate 1 and 2, environmental science) for lower performing quartile

Description

Person Responsible

Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	ESSA Subgroup 1 below 41%- English Language Learners
Rationale	For our English Language Learners subgroup, they are below the required 41% by the State of Florida for growth and proficiency. Emphasis placed on ELL students who count for growth and proficiency in state assessment areas and 12th grade students ELL students who are struggling to pass their ACT/SAT assessment to meet their reading concordant score required for graduation.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in this subgroup will reach 41% for the ESSA data collection by the State of Florida.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Increase the involvement of parents as well as the resources/strategies parents can use effectively with their students at home.</p> <p>Increase communication in multiple languages using the new automated message system that allows you to have translated messages in multiple forms (phone call, text message, and email).</p> <p>Lower performing quartile students that are also ELL will be scheduled with a bilingual teacher, Mr. Emmanuelli, that supports instruction through dual language. Through this science course students will be provided instruction that includes reading strategies and English language support.</p> <p>Sheltered ESOL students will be scheduled into language development courses with ESOL certified teachers. Use of Rosetta stone and Actively Learn for language acquisition.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With a larger bridge between the ESOL community and school, students will be given the tools to be more successful in learning the English language in order to better perform on State and Graduation-necessary Assessments.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ESOL Parent Night- we will host a ESOL parent night to share a presentation for ELL parents at the August/September family night meeting. The ESOL counselor, paraprofessionals and district staff come together to provide information in multiple languages about the curriculum, student progression plan, state and district testing and its importance in relation to scheduling/placement and graduation. 2. ESOL paraprofessionals will support students in Spanish, Burmese, and Arabic in their high accountability courses. 3. ESOL district specialists will schedule visits through out the year for pull-out interventions focusing on reading and testing strategies. 4. Bi-lingual Graduation Coach will provide the communication of multiple methods of support to remove barriers for ESOL students to earn their concordant score on the SAT or ACT for graduation. 5. Bi-lingual Dean of Students will facilitate bi-monthly Attendance Intervention Team Meetings to bring awareness to the parents of ESOL students who are missing ten or more schools days in any nine week period.

6. Language Arts teachers will work closely with Reading Interventionist and ESOL Specialist to utilize new Actively Learn reading data to meet the needs of ESOL students within ELA classrooms.

7. Our graduation coach, Ms. Martinez, works with the ESOL Specialist and district support to provide SAT/ACT bootcamps for graduation requirements. She also will monitor the grad tracker to identify students that are ELL and are struggling to meet graduation requirements and meet with these students to develop a plan to best support them to meet the requirements.

8. Student laptops will be provided as a different medium to assist with audio assistance, change in display settings, typing versus handwriting, and translating option. Students will also use the laptops in order to use the Rosetta Stone and Achieve 3000 platforms to assist with improving their lexiles and reading comprehension in English.

Person Responsible Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)

#4	
Title	ESSA Subgroup 2 below 41%- Students with Disabilities
Rationale	For our Students with Disabilities subgroup, they are below the required 41% by the State of Florida for growth and proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in this subgroup will reach 41% for the ESSA data collection by the State of Florida.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacey Johnson (tuttles1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Increase communication using the new automated message system that allows you to have translated messages in multiple forms (phone call, text message, and email). Learning Strategies support classes with certified ESE teachers for students with disabilities.</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring using the MRT and MTSS procedures.</p> <p>Push in support by ESE teachers in High Accountability Stated Tested classes.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for parents to learn about different opportunities for their children to have in post secondary transitions through a Transition Parent Night.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>With a stronger bridge in communication between the parental community and school, students will be given the tools to be more successful in learning in order to better perform on State Assessments.</p> <p>When students have goals for post secondary, it will promote the motivation needed in order to make intermediate goals throughout the year to help reach that overarching transition goal of post secondary options.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring student success in learning strategy classes 2. Transition Night for Parents; This Transition Parent Night would be focused for opportunities for students with disabilities in our learning strategy courses and CSS department. 3. All core content teachers - ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies - will work in alignment with the ESE Teacher Team to ensure all Students With Disabilities are given the appropriate support to ensure their success while maintaining a standards-based instructional environment. 4. Our Dean, Dean Boyd, removes classroom management issues by providing strategies for teachers to use with a focus on students with disabilities. He works along with the ESE Lead to remove the behavior barrier of students which allows them to focus on the learning.
Person Responsible	Stacey Johnson (tuttles1@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: Growth and LPQ Growth in Mathematics (specifically Algebra)	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Growth and LPQ Growth in ELA (both 9 and 10)	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup 1 below 41%- English Language Learners	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup 2 below 41%- Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00