

Duval County Public Schools

Neptune Beach 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Neptune Beach Elementary School

1515 FLORIDA BLVD, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

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

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Kavanagh

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 51% |
| 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (65%) 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Neptune Beach Elementary School

1515 FLORIDA BLVD, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 59% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 35% |

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.

We fully commit ourselves to every child's individual pathway to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will know how to apply the skills they learn to their 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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Kavanagh, Elizabeth | Principal | |
| Baxter, Kevin | Assistant Principal | |
| Weertz, Andrea | Assistant Principal | |
| Forte, Brooke | School Counselor | The school-based Leadership Team will meet weekly. The meetings will be designed to review screening data and to help with plans and instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The aforementioned team (or select members thereof) will review all Tier 2/3, Overage & One Plus year retained students. Formative and summative diagnostic material will be reviewed to determine areas of focus and to develop prescriptive measures. Evaluation will then occur and the cycle will repeat or expand as needed. Any student referred to MRT for consideration of ESE will be reviewed by the Rtl leadership team for supporting documentation. |
| Darcy, Marylou | 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 | 141 | 143 | 111 | 124 | 139 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 824 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 29 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 19 | 36 | 42 | 42 | 46 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 |

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 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 27 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |

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 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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

55

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 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 35 | 27 | 33 | 33 | 28 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 9 | 16 | 42 | 37 | 44 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 |

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 | 12 | 22 | 40 | 24 | 19 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |

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 | 77% | 50% | 57% | 76% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 66% | 56% | 58% | 67% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | 50% | 53% | 48% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 86% | 62% | 63% | 87% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 85% | 63% | 62% | 88% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 74% | 52% | 51% | 74% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 78% | 48% | 53% | 81% | 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 | 141 (0) | 143 (0) | 111 (0) | 124 (0) | 139 (0) | 166 (0) | 824 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 () | 29 () | 23 () | 21 () | 21 () | 17 () | 136 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 2 () | 6 (0) | 3 (0) | 1 (0) | 3 (0) | 3 (0) | 18 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 () | 1 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 6 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 19 () | 36 (0) | 42 (0) | 42 (0) | 46 (0) | 33 (0) | 218 (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 | 78% | 51% | 27% | 58% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 80% | 50% | 30% | 57% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 74% | 52% | 22% | 58% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 49% | 19% | 56% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 77% | 50% | 27% | 56% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 51% | 22% | 55% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 84% | 61% | 23% | 62% | 22% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 59% | 24% | 62% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 82% | 64% | 18% | 64% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 60% | 22% | 62% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 91% | 57% | 34% | 60% | 31% |
| | 2018 | 87% | 61% | 26% | 61% | 26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 77% | 49% | 28% | 53% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 56% | 25% | 55% | 26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 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 | 48 | 52 | 39 | 68 | 81 | 74 | 46 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 60 | | 75 | 80 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 48 | 24 | 70 | 73 | 71 | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 74 | 82 | 80 | 85 | | 77 | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | 63 | | 83 | 78 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 84 | 67 | 48 | 90 | 88 | 74 | 86 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 60 | 38 | 77 | 76 | 65 | 68 | | | | |
| 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 | 51 | 47 | 42 | 65 | 56 | 39 | 73 | | | | |

| 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 |
| ELL | 50 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 46 | 35 | 61 | 63 | 50 | 50 | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 66 | | 79 | 69 | | 88 | | | | |
| MUL | 86 | 62 | | 100 | 100 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 63 | 43 | 86 | 83 | 64 | 84 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 56 | 46 | 76 | 78 | 66 | 70 | | | | |
| 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 | 38 | 48 | 38 | 65 | 78 | 71 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 40 | | 79 | 100 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 49 | 63 | 53 | 75 | 81 | 67 | 59 | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 50 | 20 | 82 | 81 | 91 | 64 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 77 | | 88 | 100 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | 71 | 58 | 91 | 90 | 72 | 88 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 60 | 43 | 79 | 83 | 70 | 69 | | | | |

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 | 70 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 561 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 58 |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 78 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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 | 77 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 area of with the lowest performance was ELA lowest 25% gains. The ELA bottom quartile data was at 45%. For the past three years ELA bottom quartile data points has been the lowest performing area within the school.

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

Science proficiency declined by 3% from the previous year. In 2017-18, 81% of the 5th grade students were proficient compared to 78% in 2018-19.

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 compared to the state was the lower performing students in ELA. 45% of the lower performing students made gains compared to the state average of 53%.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was the math lower performing student gains. The gains went from 61% for the 2017-18 year to 74% in 2018-19.

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

The one area of concern from the EWS data, student attendance.

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

1. ELA Lower Performing Student Gains
2. ELA proficiency
3. Student Attendance
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1**

Title ELA Lower Performing Gains

Rationale The overall level of ELA Lower Performing Gains is currently at 45%. The school has demonstrated a decrease of 3% since 2016.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve The goal to increase the ELA lower performing to more closely align with the lower performing gains in mathematics of 74%. This will require a gain of approximately 28% overall for students in 3-5 grade.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Elizabeth Kavanagh (kavanaghe@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Through design, rigor, and implementation of professional development to engage and improve teacher knowledge throughout the school year in the areas of lower performance, writing, and disaggregating data (pre-planning, common planning, after school trainings) will lead to increasing lower performing student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy The overall level of ELA Lower Performing Gains is currently at 45%. The school has demonstrated a decrease of 3% since 2016. Teachers lack remediation tools and disaggregation of data to determine who the lower performing students are and how to implement classroom strategies and tools to increase student achievement/gains.

Action Step**Description**

1. Teachers visit model classrooms to enhance implementation of differentiated instruction with lower performing students.
2. Teachers meet monthly with leadership team to discuss explicit points to improve student achievement.
3. Implement professional development for LLI, Achieve 3000, i-Ready, and Top Score to assist with successfully incorporating these resources within the classroom.
4. Utilize tutors/mentors and materials to provide support and instruction for identified students.
5. Classroom walkthroughs with explicit and timely feedback to promote and drive the ongoing classroom instruction to improve student gains.

Person Responsible Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | ELA Achievement |
| Rationale | The overall level of proficiency the last three years has maintained between 73% and 77%. The trend the last three years has demonstrated that ELA proficiency has leveled off. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The goal is to increase ELA proficiency to more align with mathematics proficiency, which has trended the last three years between 83% and 86%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Elizabeth Kavanagh (kavanaghe@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Through design, rigor, and implementation of professional development to engage and improve teacher knowledge throughout the school year in the areas of lower performance, writing, and disaggregating data (pre-planning, common planning, after school training's) will lead to further improve ELA achievement at every grade level. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The overall level of proficiency the last three years has maintained between 73% and 77%. The trend the last three years has demonstrated that ELA proficiency has leveled off. Through design, rigor, and implementation of professional development, the rationale for these strategies is to more align ELA proficiency with the past trends of mathematics proficiency. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers visit model classrooms to enhance implementation of differentiated instruction with lower performing students. 2. Teachers meet monthly with leadership team to discuss explicit points to improve student achievement. 3. Implement professional development for LLI, Achieve 3000, i-Ready, Writing City and Top Score to assist with successfully incorporating these resources within the classroom. 4. Utilize tutors/mentors and materials to provide support and instruction for identified students. 5. Classroom walkthroughs with explicit and timely feedback to promote and drive the ongoing classroom instruction to improve student gains. |
| Person Responsible | Andrea Weertz (weertza@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).

N/A

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.

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Lower Performing Gains | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |