

Duval County Public Schools

Atlantic Beach 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	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantic Beach Elementary School

298 SHERRY DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/abe

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Gallagher D

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

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)	34%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (68%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantic Beach Elementary School

298 SHERRY DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/abe

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	30%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Atlantic Beach Elementary we,

- Love to Learn
- Inspire Others
- Lead with Kindness

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every child at Atlantic Beach Elementary will lead with kindness, pursue primary greatness, and have the courage to achieve their goals.

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
Gallagher, Kimberly	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure safety of all students and staff • Instructional leader • Facilitate staff professional development • Maintain and adhere to district and school calendar • Embrace community relationships
Waddill, Meredith	School Counselor	
Coffman, Carly	Assistant Principal	Carly Coffman culbrethc@duvalschools.org

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	89	85	79	73	85	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	488
Attendance below 90 percent	4	9	10	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	6	17	25	20	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	2	3	4	11	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	12	11	6	7	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15	39	24	16	39	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

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	8	11	10	5	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%	50%	57%	74%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	74%	56%	58%	70%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	46%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	62%	63%	82%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	62%	78%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	51%	69%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	48%	53%	61%	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	89 (0)	85 (0)	79 (0)	73 (0)	85 (0)	77 (0)	488 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 ()	9 ()	10 ()	7 ()	5 ()	7 ()	42 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	6 ()	17 (0)	25 (0)	20 (0)	19 (0)	28 (0)	115 (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	78%	51%	27%	58%	20%
	2018	90%	50%	40%	57%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
	2018	69%	49%	20%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	69%	50%	19%	56%	13%
	2018	78%	51%	27%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	61%	30%	62%	29%
	2018	91%	59%	32%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	64%	13%	64%	13%
	2018	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	70%	57%	13%	60%	10%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	49%	15%	53%	11%
	2018	80%	56%	24%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	45	58	59	50	58	31	27				
BLK	57	55		62	64						
HSP	60			87							
MUL	75			81							
WHT	83	78	74	84	66	48	70				
FRL	61	65	53	76	77	55	63				
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	42	25	33	58	46	36	46				
BLK	44	50		67	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
HSP	71	58		86	50						
MUL	60			80							
WHT	86	61	38	87	60	50	86				
FRL	69	57	50	77	60	64	68				
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	30	40	46	56	70	67					
BLK	18	42	36	41	75	70					
HSP	69			75							
MUL	58			75							
WHT	83	74	47	87	75	62	68				
FRL	65	61	50	70	76	76	42				

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	68
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	60
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	74
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	78
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	64
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.

Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance in both ELA and Math. The ESE teachers continue to attempt to make gains through small group instruction.

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

Hispanic Students declined from 71 to 60% proficiency in ELA. Students with Disabilities declined from 58 to 50% proficiency in Math. The school needs a better plan to identify these students to address individualized small group 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.

The Math Bottom 25% had the greatest gap. ABE is at 47% while the state average is 51%. Limited resources and tutoring in small groups.

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

Students with Disabilities showed the most improvement in ELA learning gains from 25% in 2018 to 58% in 2019. Small group individualized instruction.

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

Students with Attendance Below 90%
Students with Level 1 Achievement

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

1. Students with Level 1 in FSA Achievement in Reading
2. Students with Level 1 Achievement in Math
3. Students with Attendance Below 90%
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	If we ensure that rigorous, differentiated reading instruction is upheld in every classroom, then our proficiency and learning gains will improve in reading.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reading Proficiency 80% Reading Gains 75% Reading LPQ Gains 63%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Allow time for instructional personnel to engage in focused professional development opportunities involving analysis of student achievement data, identification of correlated learning activities, and small group standards based instructional planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If assigned learning tasks/activities are appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for reading will improve.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional personnel will be given time during common planning and early release professional development sessions to collaborate with peers in disaggregating formative assessment data, identifying intervention resources/programs, and developing standards-based activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' instructional strengths. 2. Instructional personnel will participate in common planning sessions with administration to review data from recent class/district assessments and utilize data tracking methods to identify learning gain. 3. Instructional personnel will work together during common planning to develop teacher/student data chat forms with the purpose of conducting conferences with students to measure progress toward annual learning targets. 4. Administration will identify model classrooms for differentiated, standards-based core and/or center learning activities and allow time for teachers to observe best practices of peers with targeted pre- and post- briefings. 5. Lead teachers for core content areas will attend professional development opportunities (district trainings, trainings with external organizations) related to data-based areas for growth and share strategies learned with their colleagues in order to positively impact their instruction with learners of all ability levels.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@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).

Area of Focus: Decrease in Discipline Referrals

Rationale: If we collaborate with stakeholders (i.e. teachers, parents, community) to help meet all students' needs, then more students will be able to focus on learning, leading to an increase in positive interactions and decrease in referrals.

Measurable Outcomes: Student discipline referrals will decrease from 12 (2019) to 10 (2020). 5

Essential Survey: Teachers set standards for student behavior from 55% agree (2019) to 65% (2020)

Evidenced Based Strategy: Dedicated time for leadership lessons, leadership professional development and student leadership clubs.

Rationale for Evidence Based Strategy: If school-wide behavioral expectations are appropriately structured and taught to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then student behavior will improve.

Action Steps:

1. Teachers will teach Leader in Me lessons on scheduled Wednesdays.
2. The PBIS Team will review the discipline data monthly.
3. Implement additional positive student supports, rewards and incentives (daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly)
4. Communicate the list of support networks to all stakeholders at orientation and social media
5. All students will participate in a community service project to give back to the community.