

Duval County Public Schools

John Stockton Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

John Stockton Elementary School

4827 CARLISLE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Brannan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (64%) 2014-15: A (76%)
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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

John Stockton Elementary School

4827 CARLISLE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">21%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">32%</p>

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.

Our commitment to our learning community is to inspire lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Be a learning community where highly qualified staff, motivated students, devoted parents, and committed business partners work together to create a positive school culture meeting the needs of the 21st century student.

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
Brannan, Stephanie	Principal	
Doss, Angela	Assistant Principal	
Johnston, Shelley	Teacher, ESE	

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	68	74	73	87	84	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/14/2019

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	3	1	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

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%	78%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	50%	53%	33%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	92%	62%	63%	85%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	82%	63%	62%	77%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	79%	52%	51%	61%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	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	68 (0)	74 (0)	73 (0)	87 (0)	84 (0)	67 (0)	453 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	2 ()	3 ()	5 ()	1 ()	0 ()	12 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	13 (0)
	0 (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	82%	51%	31%	58%	24%
	2018	85%	50%	35%	57%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
	2018	88%	49%	39%	56%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	87%	50%	37%	56%	31%
	2018	80%	51%	29%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	61%	27%	62%	26%
	2018	92%	59%	33%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	97%	64%	33%	64%	33%
	2018	90%	60%	30%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	91%	57%	34%	60%	31%
	2018	92%	61%	31%	61%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%
	2018	83%	56%	27%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	59	60		64	75						
BLK	64	45		83	74		40				
HSP	93			93							
MUL	100	70		88	70						
WHT	86	72	68	93	83	81	75				
FRL	75	68	62	83	68	71	65				

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	52	50		67	55						
BLK	79	64	70	76	80	60					
HSP	65			88							
MUL	81	71		88	86						
WHT	90	66	69	96	82	88	93				
FRL	84	68	70	88	85	75	71				

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	46	44	33	62	56	50	30				
BLK	54	52	33	62	67	54	55				
HSP	71	72		95	89		90				
MUL	82			76							
WHT	85	60	36	89	77	57	78				
FRL	70	52		75	80	55	62				

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	77
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	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	65
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	61
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	93
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	80
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	70
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.

Based on the state assessment data, English Language Arts learning gains and lowest performing quartile were both below 70%. Our 4th grade writing component of the ELA assessment showed only 21% at 7 or above. We had 2 new 4th grade language arts teachers and no reading coach or assistant principal to support them. The district did not have a prescriptive writing curriculum.

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

Our science data dropped from 83% to 74% (% points). We had the same teacher using the same materials as she had the year before. We are unsure of the nature as to why her scores declined.

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.

All of our scores were higher than both the district as well as the state averages. However in looking at the positives, we had the largest gap in math achievement with a difference of 19% points. Our math teachers are strong in their content area.

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

In looking at school wide state assessment data, our math lowest performing quartile improved by 2% points. That was our highest improvement. However in looking at individual grade levels, 4th grade math achievement went from 92% to 97%, learning gains went from 95% to 97% and math lowest performing quartile went from 89% to 100%. The teachers placed a larger emphasis on differentiation.

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

The only EWS that is a potential concern is the 13 level 1 students currently in 4th and 5th grade.

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

1. Increasing our ELA learning gains from 66% to 70%
2. Increasing our ELA lowest performing quartile from 64% to 70%
3. Increasing science from 74% to 80%
4. Improving overall writing scores in 4th and 5th grade English Language Arts
5. Maintaining our level 5's in English Language Arts and Math for both 4th and 5th grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Writing
Rationale	Only 21% of our 4th graders scored a 7 or above on the writing portion of the ELA FSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to see at least 50% of our 4th grade students score a 7 or above on the writing portion of the 2020 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide teachers with a research based writing program that will be incorporated into their daily schedule.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers have not had a researched based writing program in several years. The program will ensure children are writing daily with a purpose covering a variety of genres. The writing program that will be used is Top Score. Top Score has a proven record of 75% of students being proficient on the writing portion of the ELA FSA.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers have been trained how to use the writing program effectively. 2. Master schedule will ensure the writing time is built into the schedule. 3. Administration will monitor the fidelity of the implementation through walkthroughs, observations and student work (practice tests).
Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains and Lowest Performing Quartile
Rationale	Our ELA learning gains were 66% and our lowest performing quartile was 64%. 18 of the students who were level 5's for the 2017-2018 school year did not maintain a level 5 for the 2018-2019 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We want to ensure the ELA learning gains and the lowest performing quartile are at a minimum of 70% on the 2020 ELA FSA. We also want our students who scored a level 5 to maintain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide teachers with content specific professional development to better equip them with meeting the needs of their individual students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers have expressed a desire for more collaboration with grade level peers as well as vertical articulation. This was evident in the 5 Essentials survey.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide PLC time weekly (on a 6 week rotation) to allow for instructional rounding. 2. Weekly administration common planning time will be used to assist with planning, looking at data and student work and determining next steps. 3. All classroom teachers and administrators will continue studying visible learning through a book study with an emphasis on content specific areas. 4. Teachers and administrators will delve more deeply into the standards through vertical articulation to assist classroom teachers with an understanding of the continuum. 5. Administrators will conduct book studies with students who scored a level 5. 6. Our gifted lead teacher will work with helping ELA teachers create choice boards and implement more project based learning activities with the higher performing students even if they are not currently labeled "gifted".
Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	We had a 9% point decrease with 5th grade science.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We want the 5th grade science proficiency to be at a minimum of 80% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborating with colleagues
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In an effort to provide her with support as she is the only 5th grade science teacher, we have established some opportunities for collaboration.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our 5th grade science teacher will observe and debrief with other dynamic 5th grade science teachers within the district. 2. Our 4th grade science teachers will observe and collaborate with our 5th grade science teacher. 3. The 5th grade science teacher will continue to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all her students. 4. Our 5th grade science teacher will utilize her All in One cart to provide engaging lessons.
Person Responsible	Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

#4	
Title	PBIS
Rationale	Over 50% of the referrals from the 2018-2019 school year occurred in less structured areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will decrease the number of referrals that occur outside the classroom in less structured areas by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increased implementation of positive behavior interventions and supports with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research has shown that positive behavior interventions decrease negative behaviors and result in a positive school culture.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CHAMPS posted in all common areas and taught throughout the school year. 2. Implement a positive behavior incentive program for the cafeteria. 3. Examples and non examples of behavior expectations will be covered on the morning announcements via CC TV. 4. Students will be recognized for their positive choices via brag tags (E-Tags). 5. Whole classes will be recognized and rewarded when caught demonstrating correct hallway expectations. The reward is "Pizza with the Principals".
Person Responsible	Angela Doss (dossa@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).

All of our areas of focus have been addressed in the previous section.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Writing				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains and Lowest Performing Quartile				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7300	510-Supplies	0881 - John Stockton Elementary School	General Fund		\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Books will be purchased for admin-student book studies</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science				\$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: PBIS				\$771.57
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0881 - John Stockton Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$771.57
			<i>Notes: SIP funds were used to purchase the brag tag chains and charms.</i>			
					Total:	\$1,071.57