Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/landon

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Casey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	30%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (80%) 2014-15: A (86%)
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

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/landon

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	19%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

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.

n/a

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Julia Landon College Preparatory and Leadership Development School is to create college bound students with a deep commitment to public service and a true understanding of their leadership skills within the global community.

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
Bourgholtzer, MiChelle	Dean	
Bledsoe, Katrina	Principal	
Bell, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Oliver, Tracey	Assistant Principal	
Mah, Erin	Teacher, ESE	
Greene, Tracey	School Counselor	

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	39	40	0	0	0	0	122

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	19	18	14	0	0	0	0	51

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	20	0	20	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	47	40	0	0	0	0	152

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
770

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/30/2019

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	2	3	12	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	43	30	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	63	63	0	0	0	0	187

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	21	19	26	0	0	0	0	66

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	86%	43%	54%	87%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	49%	54%	76%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	45%	47%	63%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	91%	49%	58%	91%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	78%	50%	57%	81%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	47%	51%	76%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	88%	44%	51%	90%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	68%	72%	94%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	1 ()	0 ()	4 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	18 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	43 (0)	39 (0)	40 (0)	122 (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
06	2019	83%	47%	36%	54%	29%
	2018	88%	44%	44%	52%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	86%	44%	42%	52%	34%
	2018	84%	41%	43%	51%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	88%	49%	39%	56%	32%
	2018	88%	51%	37%	58%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	91%	51%	40%	55%	36%
	2018	80%	42%	38%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	87%	47%	40%	54%	33%
	2018	91%	50%	41%	54%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-91%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	88%	40%	48%	48%	40%
	2018	85%	44%	41%	50%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	69%	28%	71%	26%
2018	95%	84%	11%	71%	24%
Compare		2%			

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	91%	57%	34%	61%	30%
2018	87%	61%	26%	62%	25%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	99%	57%	42%	56%	43%
Compare		1%			

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	44	38	27	69	71	66	42	95	71		
ELL	54	46	55	69	54						
ASN	93	74	58	97	84		100	97	98		
BLK	71	58	57	75	66	65	68	93	78		
HSP	71	56	44	86	77	70	90	91	96		
MUL	84	71	64	86	82	73		94	100		
WHT	90	70	64	96	80	76	91	100	94		
FRL	68	61	63	76	68	64	76	92	79		
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	64	71	63	58	51	33	46	75	38		
ASN	97	81	89	98	82	73	92	100	96		
BLK	71	60	55	78	67	63	78	91	75		
HSP	65	65	46	81	66	57	76	92	88		
MUL	89	81		95	75			100	100		
WHT	92	76	77	89	68	52	88	96	91		
FRL	70	64	59	73	57	53	71	92	70		
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	58	57	48	55	73	68		81			
ASN	95	81	69	96	93	82	100	100	97		
BLK	72	63	56	79	70	69	78	96	85		
HSP	82	72	58	86	79	71	89	88	95		
MUL	95	79		87	84	67	76	90	78		
WHT	91	79	66	95	83	84	93	93	98		
FRL	72	66	50	76	73	65	83	81	84		

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	81
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	732
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	56
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	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
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	76
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	82
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	85
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	72
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.

ELA lost an entire point in proficiency and dropped several points in both learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains. I think that ELA teachers were the only group of teachers that were not implementing or giving formative assessments on a regular basis.

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

ELA lost an entire point in proficiency and dropped several points in both learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains. I think that ELA teachers were the only group of teachers that were not implementing or giving formative assessments on a regular basis.

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.

None. All data points were above state average.

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

Mathematics Bottom Quartile Learning Gains and Overall Learning Gains had the biggest increase. Math used the PMA (progress monitoring assessments) Additionally the hiring of a consistent and excellent Algebra 1 teacher led to gains in that area.

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

Failure rate of students in core classes as well as retention in the 7th and 8th grades.

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

1. Formative Assessments across content, but specifically ELA
2. PBIS Incentives gaining momentum
3. Differentiated Instruction based on the formative assessments
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on data, our goal needs to focus on meeting the learners where they are and the mastery of content standards.
Rationale	As a school, we are not strategically using formative assessment data to drive instruction and target students areas of weakness. There is a lack of evidence of small group instruction. There is also a lack of evidence of teachers revisiting content standards that lacked proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Formative assessment data will be consistently collected and analyzed to determine appropriate student mastery of standards and development of targeted groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use PLC time effectively.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Establish a PLC framework that maximizes time to ensure that data from formative assessments are used to drive targeted instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. Instructional personnel will use PLC time to analyze formative data available to determine implications that will identify where gaps in learning and mastery of standards are present. 2. Instructional personnel will use available resources to plan how to reteach and reassess standards not mastered on formative assessments. 3. Instructional personnel will better understand what mastery of standards looks like using the item specifications for each standard, CPALMs website, content limits, and standards analysis protocol. 4. Administration and instructional personnel will use PLC time to analyze the Year at a Glance for each course to ensure all standards are covered; time is built into the year to reteach and reassess standards not mastered, and to plan weekly targeted lessons for students. 5. Administration, Lead Teachers, and District Specialists will provide content-specific professional development around the analysis of formative assessment data, resources for targeted small group instruction, and instructional framework.
Person Responsible	Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Based on referral data, our goal needs to focus on the development of a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports system where all faculty, staff, students, and parents take ownership.
Rationale	As a school we need to implement a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Plan with fidelity, then school-wide culture will improve.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Code of Conduct Level 1 and Level 2 Infractions are decreased by 10%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use Leadership Bucks to award students that exhibit positive behavior throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Monitoring of Leadership Bucks being awarded throughout the school. Comparing points earned versus referrals received throughout the school year. Expand the PBIS Plan beyond just Leadership Bucks.
Action Step	
Description	1. Determine the top five student behaviors to positively reinforce based on the Leading LIONS Guidelines for Success 2. Provide professional development for teachers and staff on how to use the Leadership Bucks system for tracking positive behavior 3. Develop school-wide competitions to encourage students to receive Leadership Bucks 4. Develop a three year plan for expansion and what will be the additional ideas while incorporating student and teacher rewards. 5.
Person Responsible	MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@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).

As a school, we plan to use our three major parent groups to garner information of how stakeholders view areas of improvement. Our three major parent groups are PTSA, SAC, and Friends of Landon. Through each of the monthly meetings we will discuss any ongoing issues that have been previously noted or any new issues and what the action plan will be to solve them.