

Duval County Public Schools

# Lone Star Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Cheryl Quarles Gaston R**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	95%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	C	B	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.**

It is the mission of Lone Star Elementary School to challenge our students to achieve their goals and dreams.

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

Lighting the fire of learning in every child's mind.

### 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
Dutton, Richard	School Counselor	
Farrington, Leigh	Assistant Principal	
Quarles Gaston, Cheryl	Principal	

### 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	56	73	75	89	73	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
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	

**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	0	0	0	
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)**

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

Tuesday 8/27/2019

**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	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	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	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	61%	50%	57%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	56%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	50%	53%	56%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	62%	63%	77%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	71%	63%	61%



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	51%	52%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	48%	53%	56%	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	56 (0)	73 (0)	75 (0)	89 (0)	73 (0)	94 (0)	460 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	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)

**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	51%	51%	0%	58%	-7%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	75%	60%	15%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
	2018	63%	61%	2%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	49%	12%	53%	8%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	34	58	60	31	44	33	31				
ELL	53	57		53	64						
ASN	58	60		83	80						
BLK	55	69	60	67	64	33	64				
HSP	67	81		57	63						
MUL	74	79		79	79						
WHT	62	66	63	64	55	36	64				
FRL	55	69	63	58	63	43	53				

  

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	22	37	21	36	44	39	33				
ELL	20	44	55	45	60						
ASN	63	69		74	69						
BLK	44	45	35	59	38	23	48				
HSP	43	38		60	57		61				
MUL	50	38		72	43						
WHT	65	55	28	79	61	50	71				
FRL	47	48	29	63	44	30	57				

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	32	53	53	55	48	15	33				
ELL	40	57		87	86						
ASN	68	67		84	74		50				
BLK	42	57	48	68	74	55	31				
HSP	58	60		79	81	70	55				
MUL	56	56		83	75		80				
WHT	64	61	62	80	63	39	73				
FRL	47	56	50	70	73	58	50				

**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	61
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	58
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	70
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	59
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	66
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	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

**Analysis**

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Our data component with the lowest performance was LPQ math. We used our financial resources to provide push-in reading support and did not have any to provide push in math support.

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

We did not have any data that declined from the previous year.

**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 data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was LPQ math. We did not have the human capital or financial resources to provide the necessary push-in support.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was LPQ ELA. We utilized the available human capital and any resources available to provide necessary push-in support.

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

Level 1 on State Assessments in 3rd grade ELA.

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

1. MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students.
2. 3 Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional-level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction
3. 2 Phase Instruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity
4. Infuse science into all academic courses.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Moving to An A School
<b>Rationale</b>	We want to prepare our students to be college and career-ready.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We need to increase our school grade points by 13. ELA proficiency: increase by 2; ELA Gains: increase by 2; ELA Bottom Quartile: increase by 2; Math proficiency: increase by 2; Math Gains: increase by 2; Math Bottom Quartile: increase by 2; Science: increase by 2.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students.</li> <li>2. 3 Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional-level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction</li> <li>3. 2 Phase Instruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity</li> <li>4. Infuse science into all academic courses.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We are embracing the district priorities and addressing them at the school level for our students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We are reorganizing our Problem Solving Team with newly-trained members, new procedures and more accountability.</li> <li>2. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, RMSE intervention for students in K-2; LLI intervention for students in 3-5; I-Ready K-5, Duval Reads for Science and Social Studies instruction; Teach with Making Meaning curriculum; Deliver on grade-level standards-based instruction every day; Push-in classroom support with instructional paras and tutors.</li> <li>3. Eureka Math, Acaletics, I-Ready; Push-in instrucitonal support with instructional paras.</li> <li>4. Genius Hour - School-wide adoption of Genius Hour to incorporate science and inquiry into every subject area, with an emphasis on student-selected projects.</li> <li>3. A reading coach position will be used to design monitor and assess reading achievement progress; provide professional development and provide coaching for teachers.</li> <li>4. A science-lab teacher position will be used to design monitor and assess science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers</li> <li>5. A reading interventionist position will be used to provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers.</li> <li>6. Reading, math and science materials will be used to provide ways parents can assist bottom quartile students at home.</li> <li>7. Provide assistance to parents of ESE and ESOL students on ways they can assist students with academic support.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@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).**

n/a