

Duval County Public Schools

Kernan Trail 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Kernan Trail Elementary School

2281 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

Demographics

Principal: Suzanne Shall M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

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)	69%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (68%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Kernan Trail Elementary School

2281 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

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;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">71%</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;">60%</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.

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, everyday

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kernan Trail Elementary is a strategically designed standards-based learning community focused on creating relationships with all stakeholders, crafting relevant, engaging, and aligned instruction, and achieving stellar results.

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
Shall, Suzanne	Principal	Curriculum & Instruction, Building Management
Dunavant, Marcy	Other	CSS Site Coach
Lamberson, Ricky	Teacher, K-12	Teacher, Extended Day Director
	Instructional Technology	Clayton Dudjak, Technology Teacher, Safety Lead
Young, Anne Marie	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead, 4/5 ESE Literacy Teacher
LeBlanc, Julie	School Counselor	Guidance Services
Cannington, Ashley	Assistant Principal	AP

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	92	104	120	110	120	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	7	21	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	10	6	7	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	2	11	18	30	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	4	4	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

40

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	
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	
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	71%	50%	57%	68%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	56%	58%	66%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	62%	63%	82%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	63%	62%	76%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	71%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	48%	53%	59%	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	92 (0)	104 (0)	120 (0)	110 (0)	120 (0)	123 (0)	669 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	14 ()	7 ()	21 ()	10 ()	13 ()	70 (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 ()	10 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	1 (0)	34 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	13 (0)	9 (0)	29 (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	65%	51%	14%	58%	7%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
	2018	68%	49%	19%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	64%	50%	14%	56%	8%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	72%	57%	15%	60%	12%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
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	47	63	59	60	58	45	50				

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
ELL	70	73	62	70	68	36	61				
ASN	83	65		93	76		70				
BLK	64	55	47	76	67	50	68				
HSP	65	72	61	80	72	48	54				
MUL	86	69		82	69						
WHT	74	71	56	85	75	50	66				
FRL	62	64	43	75	68	49	63				
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	49	47	32	53	53	36	53				
ELL	71	74	40	81	68						
ASN	81	72		91	77		75				
BLK	60	60	35	73	57	50	56				
HSP	67	67	62	75	60	56	67				
MUL	87	72		83	61		90				
WHT	78	68	71	89	65	58	89				
FRL	70	64	45	79	62	52	68				
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	34	55	53	49	58	57	33				
ELL	43	44		77	63	70					
ASN	67	55		96	77						
BLK	67	68	53	74	68	74	60				
HSP	53	61	64	71	74		44				
MUL	88	78		92	67						
WHT	73	67	53	88	84	80	73				
FRL	62	59	47	76	70	68	45				

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	67
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	64
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	77
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	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	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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	68
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	62
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.

Science achievement data declined from 75% to 65% proficiency. This decline was anticipated due to the diverse group of 5th grade learners over the previous cohort, and paralleled the cohort's Reading FSA performance as well. The cohort had over triple the number of SWD and ELL students over the previous cohort.

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

Math proficiency for ELL students decreased by 11%, but their Math learning gains remained constant at 68%. ELL students entering had language barriers to overcome.

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 exceed the state averages in every content area.

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

Our Lowest Performing Readers gained by 8% and our Math Learning Gains increased by 9%. Targeted, prescriptive small group instruction was given during the reading and math core work

periods. In addition, we had two certified teachers who tutored LLI with our LPQ readers, and a math tutor who provided push in and pull out service for our 4th and 5th struggling mathematicians.

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

Attendance remains a challenge for students who are not mastering grade level standards.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. Lowest Performing Math
4. Reading Gains
5. Peer Collaboration & Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading Proficiency
Rationale	<p>There is a strong correlation between reading proficiency and academic success at all levels. Proficient readers develop a greater vocabulary, understand texts at a deeper level, and gain knowledge in a variety of content areas and contexts. “In one of the most extensive studies of reading yet conducted, Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding traced reading growth to reading and reading volume. They found that the amount of time students spent reading was the best predictor of reading achievement.” – Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding (1988).</p> <p>Research supports that students who are reading on grade level in elementary school are much more likely to graduate and be college and career ready.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Seventy-five percent proficiency will be shown by our intermediate readers on the Florida Standards Assessment in Reading.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-Aligned instruction Tier I using research-based, proven reading curriculum. Prescriptive Small Groups based on analysis of formative assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-aligned instruction using a core curriculum will allow teachers to formatively assess student progress toward mastering standards. When formative assessment is analyzed, prescriptive instruction is given based on a student's continued need. Common assessment and collegial conversations among teachers will allow for cohesive horizontal instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<p>A) Units of Study in Reading and Writing, and K-2 Phonics will be implemented according to the Pacing Guide.</p> <p>B) Small Group prescriptive instruction will be used to meet students' needs.</p> <p>C) Weekly Teacher Meetings will be conducted to monitor student progress.</p> <p>D) Unit and Lesson alignment to the Florida Standards will be implemented.</p> <p>E) Common Cold Reading Assessments will be administered.</p> <p>F) Student writing work will be analyzed.</p> <p>G) IReady Reading and Achieves 3000 weekly lessons and teacher analysis of data for small groups.</p> <p>H) Implementation of Guided Reading</p> <p>I) Leveled Literacy Intervention Identification and Implementation for at risk readers</p> <p>J) A reading tutor will continue to work with at risk students in Tier III.</p>
Person Responsible	Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Science, a part of the exponentially growing STEM field, is important for college and career readiness. Our students are growing up in an increasingly scientific and technological world that requires them to be scientifically literate.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science proficiency will increase from 65% proficiency to 75% proficiency on the Grade 5 state exam.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ricky Lamberson (lambersonc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-aligned core instruction with embedded hands on experiences and the integration of technology resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When state science standards drive instruction infused with hands on experiences and the integration of technology resources, student achievement in science increases.

Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Use of Science Standards to Drive Instruction B) Small Group prescriptive instruction will be used to meet students' needs. C) Weekly Teacher Meetings will be conducted to monitor student progress. E) Science Assessments will be administered. F) Student writing work will be analyzed. G) Integration of Science Technology Resources: Discovery Education, Generation Genius, Gizmos
Person Responsible	Ricky Lamberson (lambersonc@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).

Other school-wide priorities include the learning gains of our Lowest Performing mathematicians, the reading gains of all students, and the peer collaboration of the teachers.

Math teachers will plan and implement Eureka math and iReady math. LPQ mathematicians will be identified and placed in prescriptive small groups within the classroom to receive additional instruction.

Literacy teachers will plan and implement small group instruction using Guided Reading, LLI, and Strategy Groups to meet the needs of every student.

To advance peer collaboration, strategic placement of teachers within grade levels was implemented, daily common planning was scheduled, and weekly Teacher Meetings will increase horizontal teacher collegiality.

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, Â§ 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.

Kernan Trail is no longer a Title I school.

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.

Kernan Trail is no longer a Title I school.

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

Kernan Trail is no longer a Title I school.

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.

Kernan Trail is no longer a Title I school.

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

Kernan Trail is no longer a Title I school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00