

Duval County Public Schools

# J. Allen Axson 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>

# J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
<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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (67%) 2014-15: A (78%)
<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>

## J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

### 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	16%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

### 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.

To provide educational excellence to every student every day using the Montessori Method of instruction.

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

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life through the Montessori Method.

### 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
Robinson Vanhoy, Cecilia	Principal	To lead the school academically, financially and oversee all operations of school building.
Roberts, Amy	Assistant Principal	To lead and support school principal through the following areas; school academically, financially and oversee all operations of school building.

### 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	98	85	83	71	74	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	3	8	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	3	15	11	14	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	7	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

28

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

Tuesday 8/20/2019

### 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	85%	50%	57%	86%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	77%	56%	58%	68%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	50%	53%	57%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	62%	63%	87%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	63%	62%	70%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	51%	77%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	48%	53%	75%	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	98 (0)	85 (0)	83 (0)	71 (0)	74 (0)	48 (0)	459 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ( )	3 ( )	3 ( )	8 ( )	1 ( )	4 ( )	22 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 ( )	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	3 ( )	15 (0)	11 (0)	14 (0)	13 (0)	22 (0)	78 (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	90%	51%	39%	58%	32%
	2018	92%	50%	42%	57%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
	2018	76%	49%	27%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	87%	50%	37%	56%	31%
	2018	85%	51%	34%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
	2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
	2018	85%	61%	24%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	81%	49%	32%	53%	28%
	2018	82%	56%	26%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	58	62	57	61	75	61	53				
ASN	100			90							
BLK	64	47		83	78						
HSP	81	76		85	82		73				
MUL	84	79		79	71						
WHT	89	87	73	85	79	50	91				
FRL	66	62	64	76	85		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	50	50	46	50	47	36	54				
ASN	100	92		100	67						
BLK	63	58		77	53		73				
HSP	67	64		57	57						
MUL	79	52		79	61	50	80				
WHT	89	70	59	81	71	47	89				
FRL	70	60	71	64	55	44	53				

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	61	50	45	59	62	65					
ASN	85	73		85	73						
BLK	76	58		86	79						
HSP	88	73		83	55						
MUL	69	53		83	40						
WHT	91	70	67	89	75	90	83				
FRL	73	67	56	75	67	64	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	75
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	525
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	61
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	95
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	68
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	79
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	79
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	68
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.**

We dropped 1% in Science from the previous year. However, it is not the same set of students from year to year.

What we have done to strengthen science is have focused time set aside while GATE students are receiving service to work with students that need additional support in science. We have also created a Science Lab for 3-5 grade that is additional science then what is offered in the classroom.

**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 declines other than 1% drop in science 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.**

We performed higher than the district and state average in every category.

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

The areas with the highest percent growth was ELA learning gains, 10%, Math Learning Gains, 14% and Math Lowest 25th Percentile 8%.

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

The number of student retained from previous to current year. I have contacted our district IT Department as I don't believe these are accurate retention numbers from previous to current year.

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

1. ELA/Math Lowest 25%
2. ELA/Math Learning Gains
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA Achievement
5. Math Achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Behavioral
<b>Rationale</b>	To support district initiative to decrease overall student referrals by proactively addressing student behavior.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Targets for 2019-2020 Class I -1 Class II - 6 Class III - 0 Out of School Suspensions- 0 Total Events- 7
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Using restorative justice practices and adding the Calm Classroom Training for staff and to practice with students. Utilize the Threat Assessment Team to support positive outcomes for students. Utilize the Mental Health Counselor to support positive outcomes for families and students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We are using practices as outlined by the district regarding restorative justice. Using one of the options provided by the district that will work in my school, The Calm Classroom. Supporting positive family outcomes through the use of an on site Mental Health Counselor for students.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	1. Use of Student Code of Conduct 2. Training staff on the Calm Classroom, September 2019 Early Dismissal 3. Threat Assessment Team Training September 2019 4. Monitor monthly referral data toward success of 2019-2020 Behavioral targets. 5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amy Roberts (buncha@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).**

Our behavioral goal is to reduce the amount of referral from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020

2018-2019 Data:

Class I 1

Class II 9

Class III 0

Out of School Suspensions 0

Total Events 10