

Duval County Public Schools

Louis S. Sheffield 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

Demographics

Principal: Cassandra Delay N

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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)	66%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (62%)
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	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

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

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	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

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

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.

Sheffield Elementary School's mission is to provide educational excellence at our school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sheffield Elementary School's vision is a community working together to inspire and prepare all students for success in college or a career and in life

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeLay, Cassandra	Principal	
Person, Dashan	Assistant Principal	
Weber, Monica	Assistant Principal	
Gilyard, Jeanna	School Counselor	

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	146	126	107	119	128	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	771
Attendance below 90 percent	24	30	23	29	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	2	6	4	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	25	51	42	56	66	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307

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	17	22	22	31	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	3	5	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

The number of students with two or more early warning 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	45	34	38	35	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	4	5	2	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	16	37	44	63	54	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	283

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	22	37	38	47	28	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	216

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	62%	50%	57%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	60%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	62%	63%	68%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	73%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	51%	62%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	48%	53%	73%	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	146 (0)	126 (0)	107 (0)	119 (0)	128 (0)	145 (0)	771 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	24 ()	30 ()	23 ()	29 ()	24 ()	22 ()	152 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	6 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	26 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	25 ()	51 (0)	42 (0)	56 (0)	66 (0)	67 (0)	307 (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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	58%	50%	8%	56%	2%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	64%	9%	64%	9%
	2018	79%	60%	19%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	62%	57%	5%	60%	2%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	49%	15%	53%	11%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	28	37	45	40	53	41	37				
ELL											
BLK	51	48	29	58	59	44	56				
HSP	71	78		77	74						
MUL	70	73		81	73						
WHT	65	63	60	71	62	37	72				
FRL	53	57	47	51	57	44	58				
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	23	38	38	40	60	56	30				
BLK	51	56	43	67	66	57	57				
HSP	70	62		74	69		76				
MUL	70	62		74	62		90				
WHT	60	52	46	75	66	48	81				
FRL	53	54	50	64	67	51	67				

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	27	56	60	38	69	60	55				
BLK	45	62	67	56	76	70	65				
HSP	64	63		67	59		85				
MUL	80	71		75	71						
WHT	58	58	58	73	74	52	74				
FRL	48	54	56	64	74	60	61				

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	60
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	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	
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	75
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	61
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	52
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.

SWD sub-group shows the lowest performance. This sub-group has significant academic deficiencies and many are working multiple grade levels below their current grade level.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline for the 2018-2019 school year. Our fifth grade students in 2018-2019 were 8% lower in science proficiency than our fifth grade students from the previous year.

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.

Our greatest gap was in math LPQ. Sheffield Elementary was at 45% while the state was at 51%. This is an area of increased focus and we will be implementing and tracking monthly student data in order to assess effectiveness of instruction and curriculum. Many of our students have gaps in their learning and while they are making growth, it is not enough to show gains on a grade level assessment.

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

At Sheffield Elementary, our ELA LPQ showed the largest growth with an increase of 5% from 2018 to 2019. Our school had a priority focus on these students and we were very intentional with our actions last year. All of our ELA LPQ received instruction in LLI last year.

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

Reflecting on our EWS, our SWD sub-group is a potential area of concern for our school.

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

1. Increase in proficiency in the SWD sub-group.
 2. Increase in learning gains in Math.
 3. Increase in LPQ gains in math.
- Increase in science proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Bottom Quartile and Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Based on data, one of our areas of focus is on being strategic and intentional with meeting students individual needs. The data shows that learning gains, bottom quartile growth as well as our students with disabilities growth decreased from the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If assigned learning tasks/activities are appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then overall, BQ and students with disabilities learning gains for all core subject areas will improve.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher and student data chats. Monitor meeting notes to ensure effectiveness of collaboration and alignment of student needs to what is being taught. Teacher data chats will be used to ensure that student data is being utilized effectively to plan for rigorous small group instruction. -Data-Based Instructional Groupings within Weekly Lesson Plans -Differentiation Strategies within Core Lesson Plans -Early Release Meeting Agendas and Teacher Exit Tickets -Common Planning Agendas and Minutes -Data Tracking Forms -Teacher/Student Data Chat Forms -Artifacts from Differentiated Core and/or Center Classroom Activities (exit tickets based on standards/item specifications, choice boards, projects) -Grade Level Meeting Agendas and Minutes -Notes from Professional Development Trainings Attended and Debriefs with Colleagues
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Utilizing resources and reports from i-ready, achieve 3000, and Unify.
	2. Implement individual student data tracking and goal setting.
	3. Quarterly teacher data chats & with administration
	4. Professional Development based around goal setting, student conferencing, and using data to drive instruction.
	2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

#2

Title	Reducing the Number of Referrals
Rationale	Based on data, our first goal needs to focus on reducing the number of behavior referrals. The data shows that our student referrals are affecting the academic growth in our school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we collaborate with all stakeholders and effectively implement the PBIS plan to help meet all students needs, then more students will be able to focus on learning, leading to a decrease in behavioral referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Building authentic relationships between the faculty and staff and the student with a focus on supporting each individual student. Monitor referral data, school counselor referrals, and positive referrals to ensure the effectiveness of these strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	-Student surveys -Monthly discipline data shared with all stakeholders -Progress monitor guidance referrals and positive referrals -Parent Feedback -PBIS Committee agenda and minutes -Professional development and early release agendas
Action Step	
Description	1. Teacher PD on PBIS and effective classroom strategies 2. Create a student PBIS leadership group 3. PBIS teacher and parent quarterly newsletters 4. Discipline and PBIS assemblies
Person Responsible	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@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).

These additional areas will be addressed through grade level leads, shared decision making, content area experts, school advisory counsel, PTA, faith based partners and other stakeholders.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Bottom Quartile and Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reducing the Number of Referrals	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00