

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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Anchor Academy

555 WONDERWOOD DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Beale

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2019

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-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) | 29% |
| 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (65%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf | ormation* |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| | |

* 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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

| Needs Assessment Planning for Improvement Title I Requirements | 4 |
|--|----|
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Anchor Academy

555 WONDERWOOD DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy

School Demographics

| School Type and Gr (per MSID F | | 2018-19 Title I School | I Disadvant | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | chool | No | 35% | | | | | | | |
| Primary Servic (per MSID F | •• | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) | | | | | | |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 46% | | | | | | |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | | | | | | | |
| Year Grade | 2018-19 B | 2017-18 B | 2016-17 A | 2015-16 B | | | | | | |
| School Board Appro | val | | | | | | | | | |

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 a positive, safe learning environment and educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared to be successful in college, career, and in life.

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 |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | Connor, Lindsey | Principal | Responsible for Instructional and Cultural Levers within the school and oversees School Operations; monitors instruction with regularly scheduled walk-throughs and using the informal and formal components of the district's CAST system (based on the work Charlotte Danielson); leads and assists in coordinating and facilitating professional development for the staff, including job-embedded PD; serves as a member of the school's Shared Decision Making Team and the School Advisory Council. |
| | Beale-Collier, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | Responsible for Instructional Levers and student discipline; serves as the Testing Coordinator and Instructional Materials Manager; monitors instruction with regularly scheduled walk-throughs and using the informal and formal components of the district's CAST system; serves as a consultant for the School Advisory Council. |
| | | School Counselor | Ms. Keith serves as the school's Guidance Counselor; provides classroom guidance and behavior support for struggling students; oversees the MRT, CPST, and AIT meetings; monitors instructional support for ESE students using the District's FOCUS program. |
| _ | rly Warning Syst | | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| la di seten | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Number of students enrolled | 58 | 53 | 71 | 62 | 46 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 346 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | |
| 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 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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)

21

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 inc | dicators: | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 27 | 30 | 20 | 15 | 26 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indiastor | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | 66% | 50% | 57% | 69% | 49% | 55% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 56% | 58% | 72% | 56% | 57% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | 50% | 53% | 77% | 54% | 52% | |
| Math Achievement | 75% | 62% | 63% | 70% | 62% | 61% | |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | 63% | 62% | 64% | 63% | 61% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 52% | 51% | 48% | 54% | 51% | |
| Science Achievement | 66% | 48% | 53% | 66% | 50% | 51% | |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------|------------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|
| Indicator | (| Grade Le | evel (prie | or year r | eported |) | Total |
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled | 58 (0) | 53 (0) | 71 (0) | 62 (0) | 46 (0) | 56 (0) | 346 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 () | 1 () | 0 () | 1 () | 1 () | 2 () | 5 (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) | 7 (0) | 17 (0) | 6 (0) | 30 (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 | 74% | 51% | 23% | 58% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 50% | 31% | 57% | 24% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 56% | 52% | 4% | 58% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 49% | 11% | 56% | 4% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -4% | | | · · · | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -25% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 69% | 50% | 19% | 56% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 51% | 11% | 55% | 7% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 7% | | | • | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 9% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 83% | 61% | 22% | 62% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 59% | 22% | 62% | 19% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 2% | | | · · · | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 72% | 64% | 8% | 64% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 65% | 60% | 5% | 62% | 3% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 66% | 57% | 9% | 60% | 6% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 61% | 6% | 61% | 6% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -1% | ' | | · · · | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 1% | | | | |

| | | | SCIENCE | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 71% | 49% | 22% | 53% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 56% | 6% | 55% | 7% |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | · | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |

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 | 16 | 31 | 30 | 32 | 31 | 30 | 31 | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| BLK | 67 | 61 | | 70 | 67 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 62 | | 83 | 77 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 60 | 40 | 75 | 68 | 40 | 65 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 39 | | 67 | 65 | | 56 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | · | |
| 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 | 48 | 50 | | 36 | 35 | 10 | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | 41 | | 73 | 53 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 81 | 58 | | 76 | 67 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 87 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 54 | 20 | 68 | 60 | 23 | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 43 | 21 | 65 | 50 | 15 | 50 | | | | |
| | | 2017 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 50 | 71 | 70 | 52 | 63 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 73 | 70 | 55 | 57 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 81 | 75 | | 75 | 67 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 91 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 68 | 80 | 69 | 62 | 45 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 65 | 75 | 63 | 52 | 27 | 65 | | | | |

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) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 408 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 66 |
| | 66 NO |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students | NO |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Federal Index - Hispanic Students | NO 70 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO 70 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO 70 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students | 70 NO |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO 70 NO 57 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO 70 NO 57 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO 70 NO 57 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students | NO 70 NO 57 |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 60 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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.

The data component which showed the lowest performance was our Students with Disabilities. One major contributing factor is that due to our large transient military student population our students who come from out of state, and out of the country do not stay with us from year to year. Thus their knowledge isn't maintained, and their scores often don't get counted.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our FRL Population. The factors that contributed to this decline were inconsistent reading intervention, lack of transportation prevented students from receiving academic support in the form of After School Tutoring. Loss of instructional time due to low numbers school-wide, therefore having to adjust our schedule to accommodate, 3-Way Grade Level Splits.

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 when compared to the state average was our Students with Disabilities Population in the area of Reading Achievement. The state was 26%, and our SWD was 16%. The factor that contributed to this gap was due to our large transient military student population our students who come from out of state, and out of the country do not stay with us from year to year. Thus their knowledge isn't maintained, and their scores often don't get counted.

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

Math was the data component that showed the most improvement in all areas versus the District, and State data. This improvement can be attributed to our use of dedicated Math Interventionist who consistently supported, 5th-grade students through differentiated small group instruction based on individual needs.

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

Upon further reflection on EWS data, we found the following areas of concern were excessive absences, tardies, and early dismissals.

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

- 1. Writing (K-5)
- 2. Reading Intervention
- 3. Math Intervention
- 4. PBIS/Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|--|--|
| Title | Writing (K-5) |
| Rationale | Because we noticed students could have been proficient if their writing points were higher. Due to the inconsistent writing practices and conferencing, the Writing achievement data is low in proficiency. Planning with the teacher based on assessment data from student writing samples from Writing City and Top Score writing prompts is essential to ensure consistency is occurring in the classroom daily. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Higher achievement, gains, and bottom quartile gains through a focus on writing daily, through the use of Writing City, and Top Score instructional materials. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lindsey Connor (adkinsl@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Writing City in grades K-3 and Top Score in grades 4-5, will be used daily. Review student writing pieces, and provide feedback, and follow-up during bi- weekly Admin. Common Planning Meetings. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The rationale for selecting this strategy is because it is a District Mandated Curriculum. We are focusing on the fidelity of implementation in K-5. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Strengthening Literacy Development Across K-5 Content Areas; Literacy Interventions for Struggling Readers and Writers; Establish Structures and Culture for Supporting Literacy; Building Leadership Capacity; Supporting Teachers to Improve Instruction. |
| Person Responsible | Lindsey Connor (adkinsl@duvalschools.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Reading Intervention |
| Rationale | Reading Intervention in grades 3-5 was identified as an area of focus based on our 2018-2019 FSA Reading data. Our School-wide proficiency was 66% which was a 3 pt. decline from the previous year. After breaking down the data by grade level, we saw that additional support was needed in 4th grade due to only 64% of students being proficient, and only 44% of 4th graders made growth. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | If we increase instructional focus and intervention on Key Ideas/Details, Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, in grades 3-5, and writing in grades 4-5, then school-wide proficiency and overall bottom quartile gains will increase. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lindsey Connor (adkinsl@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence- based Strategy | Reading Interventionists will use LLI and other Standards-Based/Research-Based Materials. To address the area of Writing support, we will use Writing City in 3rd grade, and Top Score in grades 4-5, with fidelity. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | These Reading/Writing resources were selected by the District because of the lack of writing curriculum provided previously. Based on Writing Scores, the district realized the need for a comprehensive Writing Curriculum that teachers could use. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Teachers bring student work samples to Admin. Common Planning and discuss their progress monitoring. Admin. will conduct walkthroughs during the writing portion of the daily schedule and provide immediate feedback. Every reading teacher in grade K-5 attended Reading and Writing Professional Development Training. Teachers (K-5) will collaborate and participate in peer observations to present and breakdown standards across grade levels per content area. Principal Connor will monitor Achieve 3000 - Lessons Passed and personally monitors student achievement. She will meet with them during lunchtime, and Celebrations for passing articles at 75% or higher will be held in the first week of the month for the previous month. |
| Person Responsible | Lindsey Connor (adkinsl@duvalschools.org) |

| #3 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Title | Math Intervention | | |
| Rationale | Math Intervention in grades 3-5 was identified as a continued area of focus based on our 2018-2019 FSA Math data. Our School-wide proficiency: 77% (+6), Gains: 67% (+7), and Bottom Quartile Gains: 43% (+16) all increased from the previous year. After disaggregating the data by grade level, we saw that in order to continue this progress, intervention support must be maintained in 5th, and implemented with fidelity in 3rd, and 4th. | | |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | If we increase instructional support on the identified areas of need i.e., Number and Operations in Base Ten & Measurement, Data, and Geometry in grades 3-5, and if we identify the foundational skills needed and provide systematic interventions for our 4th and 5th-grade LPQ students, we will increase our overall bottom quartile gains, gains, and school-wide proficiency. | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org) | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy | Math Interventionists will use Eureka Math and other Standards/Research-Based Materials to provide small-group instruction/remediation in grades 3-5 to identified LPQ students. | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | /e chose Eureka Math and other Standards / Research-Based Materials to help nterventionists provide differentiated instructional support to identified students in grades -5. | | |
| Action Step | | | |
| Description | We strategically developed a targeted schedule aimed at providing instructional supports to identified LPQ Students in 3-5. Teachers bring student work to Admin. Common Planning and discuss their progress | | |
| Person Responsible | Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org) | | |

| #4 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Title | PBIS/Attendance | |
| Rationale | The Positive Behavior and Intervention Support (PBIS) document outlines the school's school-wide behavior system. At Finegan, we believe in giving each child the tools to succeed in life. We use teaching, modeling, and other appropriate strategies to maintain the positive behaviors necessary to ensure a safe, orderly, and productive learning environment. Teachers have been trained in the use of CHAMPs and strive to maintain a 5:1 ratio of interaction with students. Additionally, Restorative Justice is often implemented by both the AP and School Counselor when addressing Class I & II student disciplinary issues. | |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | We've also implemented a student wellness program involving the "highlighting of monthly character traits" on "WFIN." This program not only reminds our students of the character trait's meaning but also reinforces their ability to be a "H.E.R.O. Helpful, Encouraging, Responsible and Outstanding." This program reinforces our school's mission, "There's a H.E.R.O in everyone" and directly impacts and positively influences Finegan's climate and culture by increasing students' confidence and ownership of their behavior. | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org) | |
| Evidence- based Strategy | The Anchor Program is a character-based incentive program for our students. Each month highlights a specific character trait which the teacher uses to select which students they eel most exemplifies that trait. If we implement a Character Trait Program, then we will increase students' personal accountability and positively impact the climate and culture of our school. | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | Attendance is monitored by the CRT/Records Clerk via FOCUS and Attendance Intervention Team (A.I.T) meetings are scheduled for identified students (as needed), based on district guidelines. At the first sign of any behavior issue, Finegan employs a positive behavior system that analyzes the behaviors' root causes and uses various resources and strategies to avert behavior that impairs learning. Such strategies and resources include: Restorative Justice, partnering with parents, teachers, School counselors, MFLC, Mental Health Therapist and Communities in Schools. Per the Student Progression Plan, when a student's grade falls below a "C", written notification is sent home to inform parents of students' academic struggles. This notification will act as an early warning indicator of declining academic performance. | |
| Action Step | | |
| | 1. Character Trait - Silver & Golden Anchor Awards Program | |
| Description | The school counselor works with students both through classroom guidance, in small group and one-on-one interactions. She is also involved in the behavior support aspect of the school discipline process. Since almost 80% of Finegan's students are from military families, the school has two | |

Military and Family Life Counselors (MFLC) to address the unique challenges faced by those families. Sponsored by the Department of Defense, the program offers private and confidential non-medical counseling to Servicemembers' families, children, and staff. 4. As a result of being awarded a DODEA "Anchor Grant," which ends May 2020, we've received a Mental Health Therapist who provides private and confidential mental health counseling services, and support to both our "Military" and "Non-Military" students and their families.

Person Responsible Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@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, § 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.

The school uses several media venues to keep parents informed about the school, its mission and work: school's and teachers' websites, weekly messages sent out by the district's School Messenger system, monthly parent newsletters, and the District's Grade Portal. The school has also created a resource room for parents and families (Finegan Family Resource Center) to gather, work on projects, meet/talk and have computer access. This room will also serve as a source of support for our military families. The room is equipped with books and resources for families experiencing deployment and houses technology, that allows students to Skype with their deployed parents. The school will also be providing monthly Parent Academies that will help parents understand our work and how to effectively support their children. Our school's PTA has several websites it uses to keep parents informed and to invite them to participate in school functions. Additionally, a parent kiosk has been set up in the main office for parents to access district websites as needed.

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.

The school counselor works with students both through classroom guidance, in small group and one-on-one interactions. She is also involved in the behavior support aspect of the school discipline process. Additionally, since almost 80% of Finegan's students are from military families, the school has two Military and Family Life Counselors (MFLC) to address the unique challenges faced by those families. Sponsored by the Department of

Defense, the program offers private and confidential non-medical counseling to Servicemembers' families, children, and staff. Through the work of the Educational

Liaison at Naval Station Mayport, the school has been granted funds that will provide for the development of our Family Resource Center allowing our military families to stay in touch with deployed members via specialized technology. Additionally, as a result of being awarded a DODEA "Anchor Grant," we've received a Mental Health Therapist who will provide private and confidential medical counseling services and support to both our "Military" and "Non-Military" students and their families.

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

Staff administers and uses curriculum guide assessments, teacher observations, the teacher made checklists and FLKRS data to determine the level of student readiness for given grade levels. The school also partners with ChildFind and other local agencies. Grade level orientations and Open House are used as vehicles to provide parents with expectations for the coming year.

The Guidance Counselor from the local middle school meets with all 5th-grade students to help them understand the transition, expectations at the secondary level, and to help them plan their courses for the following year. Additionally, the middle school provides a week-long transition camp prior to the beginning of the new year.

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.

The school-based Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS/CPST) Team meets monthly to engage in school-wide problem-solving. Facilitated by Jennifer Beale-Collier, Assistant Principal, and Eliese Keith, our School Counselor, the team will engage in the following activities:

1. Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

2. Identify professional development needs and MTSS resources.

3. Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions.

4. Review progress monitoring data

5. Monitor MTSS activities conducted by the collaborative teacher to assure sound problem-solving and fidelity of intervention implementation.

6. Based on data and discussions the team will identify students in need of academic and/or behavioral support. An intervention plan will be developed which identifies specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure that the necessary resources are available and the plan is implemented with fidelity.

Jennifer Beale-Collier, the school's Assistant Principal, serves as the Instructional Materials Manager and, as such, oversees the inventory and assignments of instructional resources.

Supplemental Academic Instruction(SAI) funds will be used for after school remediation and enrichment for identified subgroup not meeting expectations, and those exceeding expectations.

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

School-Wide Virtual College Tours will be offered once a week on WFIN in May 2020. College Tours - 3rd, 4th & 5th-grade students will visit: FSCJ, JU, and UNF once a year to get exposed to what college is like.

School Counselor will create a Career Day with various Local and City,

Robotics League - grades 3, 4, & 5 has exposed students to various careers in technology as well as provided hands-on experience in the field of programming.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Writing (K-5) | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Reading Intervention | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math Intervention | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: PBIS/Attendance | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |