Duval County Public Schools

# John E. Ford K 8 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 15

Title I Requirements 19

Budget to Support Goals 20

# John E. Ford K 8 School

1137 CLEVELAND ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/johneford

## Demographics

### Principal: Tina Bennett M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>PK-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 94% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: B (58%)<br>2016-17: C (48%)<br>2015-16: B (60%)<br>2014-15: B (54%) |
| **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** 15

**Title I Requirements** 19

**Budget to Support Goals** 20

# John E. Ford K 8 School

1137 CLEVELAND ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/johneford

## 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Combination School PK-8 | Yes | 97% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 87% |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

The mission of John E. Ford PK-8 English/Spanish Montessori School is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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

Together, our school community provides a culturally-conscious, nurturing, and respectful environment in which we intentionally foster creative and confident humanitarians.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett, Tina | Principal | The Principal oversees all areas of the SIP. |
| Ingram, Shana | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal is responsible for specific subject areas. |
| Hernandez , Wanda | Other | |
| Winterbottom, Shauna | School Counselor | |
| Curran, Elizabeth | School Counselor | |
| Wright, Dishon | Dean | The Dean oversees all referrals and safety issues. |

## 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 | 126 | 124 | 108 | 84 | 67 | 49 | 34 | 20 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 639 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 37 | 29 | 18 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 12 | 19 | 20 | 37 | 20 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

**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 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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)**

55

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

Thursday 7/11/2019

## 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 | 39% | 54% | 61% | 39% | 50% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | 56% | 59% | 48% | 54% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | 53% | 54% | 49% | 47% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 45% | 57% | 62% | 36% | 52% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 63% | 57% | 59% | 45% | 52% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 52% | 52% | 41% | 46% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 45% | 50% | 56% | 34% | 47% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 68% | 76% | 78% | 88% | 76% | 75% |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 126 (0) | 124 (0) | 108 (0) | 84 (0) | 67 (0) | 49 (0) | 34 (0) | 20 (0) | 27 (0) | 639 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 37 () | 29 () | 18 () | 13 () | 8 () | 6 () | 3 () | 0 () | 0 () | 114 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 12 () | 19 (0) | 20 (0) | 37 (0) | 20 (0) | 14 (0) | 7 (0) | 4 (0) | 5 (0) | 138 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 38 (0) | 15 (0) | 13 (0) | 11 (0) | 4 (0) | 5 (0) | 86 (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 | 25% | 51% | -26% | 58% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 50% | -13% | 57% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 35% | 52% | -17% | 58% | -23% |
| | 2018 | 29% | 49% | -20% | 56% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 38% | 50% | -12% | 56% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 51% | -15% | 55% | -19% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 41% | 47% | -6% | 54% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 44% | -13% | 52% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 45% | 44% | 1% | 52% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 41% | 1% | 51% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 58% | 49% | 9% | 56% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 51% | 20% | 58% | 13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 16% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 28% | 61% | -33% | 62% | -34% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 59% | -21% | 62% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 64% | -19% | 64% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 35% | 60% | -25% | 62% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 34% | 57% | -23% | 60% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 61% | -18% | 61% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 55% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 42% | 12% | 52% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 30% | 47% | -17% | 54% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 50% | -12% | 54% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -24% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 76% | 32% | 44% | 46% | 30% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 31% | 52% | 45% | 38% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 38% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 39% | 49% | -10% | 53% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 56% | -7% | 55% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 46% | 40% | 6% | 48% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 44% | 27% | 50% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -25% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 70% | 69% | 1% | 71% | -1% |
| 2018 | 87% | 84% | 3% | 71% | 16% |
| Compare | | -17% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 57% | 43% | 61% | 39% |
| 2018 | 100% | 61% | 39% | 62% | 38% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 30 | 51 | 67 | 33 | 38 | 25 | 60 | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 51 | 53 | 41 | 62 | 53 | 40 | 69 | 100 | | |
| HSP | 39 | 50 | | 56 | 64 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 55 | 64 | | 42 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 69 | | 75 | 81 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 52 | 56 | 37 | 59 | 56 | 33 | | | | |

| 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 | 33 | 40 | | 39 | 33 | | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 45 | 52 | 41 | 52 | 43 | 54 | 86 | 100 | | |
| HSP | 67 | 64 | | 74 | 67 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 31 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 64 | | 61 | 45 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 41 | 51 | 40 | 49 | 43 | 52 | 83 | 100 | | |

| 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 | 20 | | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 45 | 45 | 33 | 44 | 44 | 27 | 86 | | | |
| HSP | 85 | | | 54 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 60 | | 50 | 47 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 26 | 42 | 47 | 25 | 38 | 42 | 27 | 83 | | | |

## 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 516 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

**Subgroup Data**

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 43 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 73 |
| 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.**

Reading proficiency. This has been a trend at Ford for the past several years. Teachers need to implement instruction fully aligned to the Florida standards to improve the proficiency in Reading.

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

Civics...we saw a twenty point drop last year and this is unusual for Ford. We have a very small group of students (one class) and instruction was inhibited by the teacher's absence due to illness. With our focus on reading improvement and a new teacher this year, we expect to see our scores return to normal.

**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.**

Our biggest gap appeared in reading proficiency. This has been a trend at Ford for the past several years. Teachers need to implement instruction fully aligned to the Florida standards to improve the proficiency in Reading. Our focus for 19-20 is improving the reading proficiency percentage, while keeping our other indicators on the upswing as well.

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

Math gains showed the largest improvement, moving from 52 points to 63 points last year. We have been focused on math for the past three years and put specific strategies in place to align instruction to standards. Teachers targeted specific students for growth and administrators held data chats with these same students. This high focus propelled students to do their best and we saw our best growth.

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

1. Course failure in reading and or math
2. Absenteeism

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

1. Reading proficiency using Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, LLI and core instruction aligned to Florida standards
2. Science instruction in elementary and middle. Instruction will be aligned to Florida Standards and Acaletics will be implemented with fidelity.
3.
4.
5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Reading Proficiency and Gains |
| **Rationale** | To improve the content-knowledge of the standard by understanding the rigor and content limits of the standards. If teachers will exhibit a high level of content knowledge of Florida Standards then they will be able to make targeted data driven decisions to instruct students to higher achievement levels. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Data analysis will show in an increase in FSA Proficiency and Gain scores for the 19/20 school year; Shifts in instructional practice as evidenced by weekly standards based classroom walkthroughs. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Tina Bennett (bennettt@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Data analysis will show in an increase in FSA Proficiency and Gain scores for the 19/20 school year; Shifts in instructional practice as evidenced by weekly standards based classroom walkthroughs.. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | As teachers gain a deeper understanding of standards and alignment of instruction to those standards, student proficiency will increase and gains will be attained. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Bi-Weekly Common Planning: Instructional personnel will participate in common planning sessions with administration and coaches to review data from recent class/ district assessment and utilize data tracking methods to identify learning gains.<br>2. Standards Based Classroom Walkthroughs: Administration, coaches and teachers will carve out time to observe best practices of peers with targeted pre and post briefings.<br>3. Fidelity to Montessori Methods: During work-cycle, students will be given targeted differentiated instruction and teachers will pull small groups to remediate based on student needs.<br>4. Addition of a Reading Interventionist: Students will receive pre and post tests to determine instructional level for implementation of Leveled Literacy Intervention Program. |
| **Person Responsible** | Shana Ingram (ingrams@duvalschools.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Montessori Training |
| **Rationale** | If we select and retain highly qualified Montessori teachers then students will be fully exposed to the Montessori Method. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Through training, teachers will transfer this new learning into lesson planning, instructional delivery and student work products. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Tina Bennett (bennettt@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | By fulfilling the requirements as outlined by the training, teacher will receive a Montessori certification diploma after approximately 24 months. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | By providing teachers with the proper curricular training, they will better excel in their field of study. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Provide certified montessori training.<br>2. Montessori Training for two new teachers being provided with Title I funds.<br>3.<br>4.<br>5. |
| **Person Responsible** | Tina Bennett (bennettt@duvalschools.org) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Reading Coach |
| **Rationale** | Through weekly common planning and coaching cycles, teachers will lesson plan, collaboratively and with precision, to effectively teach to the core curriculum standard being addressed |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Evidence of student work that reflects proficiency of the standards being addressed and shifts in instructional practice. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Shana Ingram (ingrams@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Curriculum Mapping through weekly common planning. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Weekly Common Planning and Professional Learning Communities, artifacts of data-driven small group instruction |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Lesson plan with reading coach and administration<br>2. Purchase of Reading Coach Position with Title 1 funds.<br>3.<br>4.<br>5. |
| **Person Responsible** | Tina Bennett (bennettt@duvalschools.org) |

| #4 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Media Specialist |
| **Rationale** | If students are provided additional support and opportunities to support reading instruction in the classroom, we will reach our goal of increasing our reading proficiency. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Increased Reading proficiency by 5%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Tina Bennett (bennettt@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Collaborate with teachers to provide additional lessons aligned to standards. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | By providing teachers with this collaboration time and experience students will be able to meet the state standards at a higher level. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Purchase of half media specialist with Title 1 funds.<br>2.<br>3.<br>4.<br>5. |
| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

| #5 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Math Proficiency and Gains |
| **Rationale** | To improve the content-knowledge of the standard by understanding the rigor and content limits of the standards. If teachers will exhibit a high level of content knowledge of Florida Standards then they will be able to make targeted data driven decisions to instruct students to higher achievement levels. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Data analysis will show in an increase in FSA Math Proficiency and Gain scores for the 19/20 school year; Shifts in instructional practice as evidenced by weekly standards based classroom walkthroughs. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Tina Bennett (bennettt@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Biweekly common planning will allow teachers to align instruction to standards and provide aligned, rigorous instruction to students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | As teachers gain a deeper understanding of standards and alignment of instruction to those standards, student proficiency will increase and gains will be attained. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Bi-Weekly Common Planning: Instructional personnel will participate in common planning sessions with administration and coaches to review data from recent class/ district assessment and utilize data tracking methods to identify learning gains.<br>2. Standards Based Classroom Walkthroughs: Administration, coaches and teachers will carve out time to observe best practices of peers with targeted pre and post briefings.<br>3. Fidelity to Montessori Methods: During work-cycle, students will be given targeted differentiated instruction and teachers will pull small groups to remediate based on student needs.<br>4. Addition of Acaletics and Math 180 licenses students will gain core knowledge of math and thus increase scores and gains on FSA. |
| **Person Responsible** | Shana Ingram (ingrams@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.**

John E. Ford uses the Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

**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.**

na

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

na

**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.**

na

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

na

## Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency and Gains | $0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Montessori Training | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Reading Coach | $0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Media Specialist | $0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency and Gains | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |