

Duval County Public Schools

# Oceanway 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>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Oceanway School

143 OCEANWAY AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Elizabeth Stansel**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: C (48%)
<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>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Oceanway School

143 OCEANWAY AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>74%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>50%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

## 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.**

Oceanway Middle School’s mission is to prepare all students for success in rigorous high school courses – and, ultimately, for all students to graduate and proceed to college or technical training.

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

Our vision is to put into action through social-emotional programs and a focus on continuous instructional improvement, experiences to elevate our students' literacy, numeracy, and social competencies, and a commitment to build stakeholder value by making Oceanway an A-rated, comprehensive middle school.

### 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
Kristansen, Emily	Principal	Leads all instruction and operational initiatives of school.
Harris, Trenton	Assistant Principal	
Cooper, Mary	Assistant Principal	
Boehm, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	375	352	344	0	0	0	0	1071
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	53	23	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	27	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	55	55	0	0	0	0	141

**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	44	54	51	0	0	0	0	149

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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)**

31

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

Friday 8/30/2019

**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	69	53	23	0	0	0	0	145
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	31	55	55	0	0	0	0	141

**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	41%	43%	54%	36%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	49%	54%	45%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	45%	47%	42%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	52%	49%	58%	40%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	50%	57%	48%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	47%	51%	43%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	42%	44%	51%	45%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	68%	72%	51%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	375 (0)	352 (0)	344 (0)	1071 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	69 ( )	53 ( )	23 ( )	145 (0)
One or more suspensions	12 (0)	19 (0)	27 (0)	58 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	31 (0)	55 (0)	55 (0)	141 (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
06	2019	42%	47%	-5%	54%	-12%
	2018	46%	44%	2%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	44%	-6%	52%	-14%
	2018	34%	41%	-7%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	44%	49%	-5%	56%	-12%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
	2018	43%	42%	1%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	54%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	40%	32%	8%	46%	-6%
	2018	20%	31%	-11%	45%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	31%	40%	-9%	48%	-17%
	2018	42%	44%	-2%	50%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	98%	67%	31%	67%	31%
2018					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
Compare		-31%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	88%	57%	31%	61%	27%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Compare		11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
2018	92%	57%	35%	56%	36%
Compare		-92%			

**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	32	29	23	40	43	18	45	50		
ELL	24	39	36	57	63						
ASN	53	67		94	73						
BLK	35	44	42	40	46	45	31	62	85		
HSP	54	51	42	60	65	75	46	82	89		
MUL	38	44		58	57	55	25	56			
WHT	43	46	38	55	54	53	48	69	84		
FRL	39	44	37	46	51	49	41	66	87		
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	13	36	30	22	40	30	10				
ELL	24	59	55	43	68						
ASN	50	65		75	58						
BLK	36	47	47	36	44	48	29	89	77		
HSP	52	61	52	56	51	50	52		75		
MUL	55	60		53	48		60				
WHT	44	50	40	46	46	35	46	88	79		
FRL	39	48	41	40	44	41	35	90	78		
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	9	30	31	15	40	40	12	25			
ELL	13	21		44	40						
ASN	57	50		78	68		80		100		
BLK	28	41	42	32	44	38	30	55	72		
HSP	36	41	27	36	51	39	33	54			
MUL	26	27		42	41			58			
WHT	41	49	44	42	50	47	55	47	64		

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
FRL	31	44	41	31	45	42	38	46	55		

**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	52
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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	43
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	72
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	48
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	63
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	48
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	54
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	51
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.**

Compared to the prior year, the Civics component showed the greatest decline. The decline is due to restructured scheduling of students and revised course progression.

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

Compared to the prior year, the Civics component showed the greatest decline. The decline is due to restructured scheduling of students and revised course progression.

**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 greatest gap when compared to the state average can be seen in ELA Achievement. The largest contributing factor to this gap is inattention to the intention and demands of standards on students.

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

The Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest increase of 10 points. This increase in achievement is attributable to strategic scheduling of students. All of our students in the LPQ were provided an enrichment math class. During this time, teachers worked with students in small groups on targeted standards and skills.

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

Students in 8th grade had the highest number of students with multiple suspensions. Students in 6th grade had the highest number of students with excessive absences.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Science Achievement
3. Civics Achievement
4. ELA LPQ Gains
5. Math LPQ Gains

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Standards-based Classrooms
<b>Rationale</b>	
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Every student should have access to grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers with high expectations, every day, in every class—regardless of their race, ethnicity, or any other part of their identity. We will continually investigate the extent to which our students receive this access and report on our progress.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Emily Kristansen (kristansee@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Faculty will engage in content-specific PLCs on a biweekly basis. The PLCs will focus on (1) Standards Analysis; and (2) EQUIP protocol to analyze student work.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<a href="https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org">https://opportunitymyth.tntp.org</a>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make greater access to grade-appropriate assignments an urgent priority for all students, no matter what their race, income level, or current performance level. Teachers utilize grade-level appropriate curriculum and materials in every class, every day.</li> <li>2. In all PLCs, provide teachers materials-based professional learning to ensure that teachers know the value in grade-appropriate assignments and how to use them well. EQUIP and Standards Analysis protocols will be utilized in every PLC.</li> <li>3. Administrators conduct a minimum of five standards-based walkthroughs daily. Three of the walkthroughs must be collaborative and result in discussion to calibrate observation of standards-based instruction.</li> <li>4. Develop a Standards-Based Classrooms Focus group. The purpose of this team is to provide feedback and direction to the faculty's need for professional development and/or differentiation of feedback. This team will meet monthly to conduct three collaborative standards-based walkthroughs.</li> <li>5. Administrators will complete district-developed standards-based classrooms online module.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Federal Percent of Points Index below 41% - Students with Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	Subgroup does not meet ESSA requirements
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students with disabilities index will improve to 45%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Emily Kristansen (kristansee@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

**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).