

Duval County Public Schools

Parkwood Heights Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

1709 LANSLOWNE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

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

Demographics

Principal: Ashton Price J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
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 www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

1709 LANSDOWNE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

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

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 KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

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

In collaboration with family and community the mission of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to provide an academically rigorous learning experience in a safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to do what is best for children as we develop competent independent learners who are eager to explore the possibilities of what they can become.

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
Price, Ashton	Principal	Responsible for all aspects of school operation.
Rivers, Marshana	Assistant Principal	Test Coordinator, data mining and assists in instructional planning.
Clark, Amy	Instructional Coach	Responsible for aspects of Reading and helps with the coaching of best practices in the area of reading.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	15	8	24	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	21	44	30	60	39	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228

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	

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	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)

18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

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	20	22	28	29	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	1	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	11	30	36	45	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181

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	11	31	35	34	24	19	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	37%	50%	57%	46%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	56%	58%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	62%	63%	45%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	63%	62%	60%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	47%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	48%	53%	36%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 ()	15 ()	8 ()	24 ()	6 ()	13 ()	78 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	9 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	21 ()	44 (0)	30 (0)	60 (0)	39 (0)	34 (0)	228 (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	42%	51%	-9%	58%	-16%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
	2018	35%	49%	-14%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	26%	50%	-24%	56%	-30%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
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	13	22	29	24	37	29					
ELL	17			56							
BLK	33	43	38	48	58	40	30				
HSP	38			69							
WHT	49	65		51	50						
FRL	31	42	46	41	47	40	21				
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	16	31		31	71						
ELL	30			40							
BLK	33	38	47	47	65	63	50				
HSP	57			50							
WHT	57	56		83	89		87				
FRL	38	40	47	54	69	63	62				

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	7	29		19	57						
BLK	41	58	47	39	59	57	27				
HSP	59			31							
WHT	57	58		60	69		56				
FRL	40	53	50	37	57	46	27				

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	96
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	56
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	49
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	54
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
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.

Parkwood Heights Elementary lost 27 points in the area of Science. This lost was due to our inability to get students to master the tested standards. Instructor spent too much time reviewing standards that should have been mastered in previous grades.

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

Parkwood Heights Elementary lost 27 points in the area of Science. This lost was due to our inability to get students to master the tested standards. Instructor spent too much time reviewing standards that should have been mastered in previous grades.

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 shows that 5th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

ELA learning gains showed the largest improvement with a 2% increase. There were no new actions that took place . constantly trying to give our student equivalent experiences of the type of rigor they will have during assessments.

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

EWS data from 2018-2019 indicates that 78 out 342 students had attendance below 90 percent.

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

1. Increase Reading Proficiency
2. Increase Math Proficiency
3. Increase Science Proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading proficiency
Rationale	The level of proficiency went down in the area of Reading 3% points and lowest performing quartile also decreased by 4 percentage points.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the proficiency of students taking the FSA from 37% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The use of Corrective Reading with fidelity in grades 3rd-5th.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Corrective Reading has been proven to remediate and advance students ability to read and comprehend on grade level. We recently decreased in proficiency by 3 percentage points.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development for all instructors 2. Create a schedule that will allow students to remediate their skills with students with like deficiencies. 3. Create a schedule that will allow Reading Interventionist to support struggling learners. 4. Use paraprofessional to assist with small group instruction 5.
Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math proficiency
Rationale	The use of Acaletics program with fidelity has been proven to increase student achievement in the area of mathematics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the percentage of students that are deemed proficient via the Math FSA from 51% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The use of this program will allow us to extend exposure to concepts and skills as well as multi-domain exposure to concepts and skills within the designated class period.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The unique combination of content focused materials that are fully-aligned with the more rigorous state standards, data driven instructional best practices, a system of assessment and accountability and ongoing formal and informal professional development.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students scheduled correctly to receive program. (2nd-5th) 2. Teachers receives ongoing professional development monthly 3. Implement program with fidelity 4. Monthly scrimmage periods for students 5.
Person Responsible	Ashton Price (pricea@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	School Climate and Culture (PBIS)
Rationale	The increasing number of ELL's and parents that are having difficulty navigating the education landscape.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If families cultural diversities are recognized then we will create a safe and civil school that fosters student growth and development.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Marshana Rivers (bushm2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The increasing number of ELL's and the needs of their families to adjust to American educational system has made a Parent Liaison a needed resource.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Parent Liaisons create a bridge between schools and families and encourages parental involvement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional for all staff on MTSS 2. Ongoing progress meetings for MTSS 3. Parent Liasion will assist in scheduling and implementing data chats with parents. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Marshana Rivers (bushm2@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, 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.

Parkwood Heights Elementary builds and sustains positive relationships with local community by making sure that they are a active part of our school community. We are always looking for opportunities to help a business by giving them our student work to display or having a spirit night at their business. We also invite our community partners to participate in our school activities.

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.

Parkwood Heights ensures that all student social and emotional needs are met by training staff on signs that may indicate a student is in need of support. The school also utilizes Full-Service Schools to help support students with wrap around services.

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

Parkwood Heights Elementary invites neighboring childcare centers to tour our school in the Spring. We also participate in the School Choice Fair and discuss our school's offerings with prospective parents. Our outgoing students also have opportunities to tour middle school and an in-school field trip to our neighboring middle 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.

Parkwood Heights Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) meets routinely, once monthly, to assess district and state assessments and/or to hear teacher concerns regarding individual student academic growth. All students are given Tier 1 Core Instruction. Those students struggling are identified by the CPST and the Gen Ed teacher and the area(s) of concern are addressed by a Tier 2 Intervention Plan, providing the student a small group setting meeting at least 3 times a week for remediation in the area of concern. Specific

Tier 2 Interventions have been identified for use in Reading/ELA, Math, and Science. Should the student continue to struggle and fails to catch up with his classmates, i.e. fails to "close the gap" in a timely manner, the Gen Ed teacher, the CPST and parent meet to address a more intensified Tier 3 Intervention, which involves meeting daily and in an even smaller group size. Should these efforts fail to move the student into the academic range of his peers in an appropriate and timely manner, then the CPST will refer the student to the Multi Resource Disciplinary Team involving district and school personnel to assess and determine eligibility for Exceptional Student Services (ESE). Should eligibility be determined, these students will be provided with continuing academic or emotional/behavioral support provided by our school's ESE resource teachers, driven by data with goals and objectives set forth on the student's Individual Educational Plan (IEP). Resource allocation for funding and staffing of ESE resource teachers is determined by the number of ESE students at our school as well as the number of Tier 3 students needing support.

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

Parkwood Heights will institute a weekly activity by which professionals will be invited to share their occupations with our students. College students mentor Parkwood students and countless college-bound Seniors volunteer at Parkwood Heights Elementary encouraging students to excel.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading proficiency	\$129,633.00
---	--------	-------------------------------------	--------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2081 - Parkwood Heights Elementary School			\$64,094.00
			<i>Notes: Reading interventionist</i>			
			2081 - Parkwood Heights Elementary School			\$65,539.00
			<i>Notes: Paraprofessionals</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math proficiency				\$16,045.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2081 - Parkwood Heights Elementary School			\$16,045.00
			<i>Notes: Acaletics</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Climate and Culture (PBIS)				\$12,215.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2081 - Parkwood Heights Elementary School			\$12,215.00
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison</i>			
Total:						\$157,893.00