

Duval County Public Schools

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School

8000 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

Demographics

Principal: Julie Ehrenberg

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 PK-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)	83%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: B (60%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary School

8000 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

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	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

At Twin Lakes Academy Elementary we foster a sense of leadership in all of our students. We want our students to focus on becoming lifelong learners and seek to excel in all endeavors which will lead to achieving their dreams.

Wildcats LEAD: Learn, Excel, Achieve, Dream

Provide the school's vision statement.

Twin Lakes Academy Elementary is working together to Create Leaders for 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
Robertson, Denise	Principal	Principal Denise Robertson leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. She leads observations, evaluations, professional development and data reviews. Mrs. Robertson works with PTA, SAC, Shared Decision making, and the MTSS Team.
Jones, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Melissa Jones coordinates testing, computer-based instruction programs and compiles data from Performance Matters. She leads discipline and parent relations for grades K-5. Ms. Jones coordinates SAC and serves on Shared Decision Making and MTSS. She coordinates SIP goals, conducts focus walks and observations, provides professional development and coaching to teachers.
	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Rick Kane coordinates attendance meetings and student scheduling, serves as textbook manager, and coordinates teacher and staff duties. He leads discipline and parent relations for grades K-5. Mr. Kane serves on SAC, Shared Decision Making, and MTSS. He coordinates PBIS goals, conducts focus walks and observations, and provides professional development and coaching to teachers.

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	140	162	128	158	157	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	901
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	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	5	14	16	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

45

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	38	20	19	24	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	24	25	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	1	1	24	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	55%	50%	57%	59%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	59%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	50%	53%	54%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	62%	63%	65%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	62%	63%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	52%	51%	53%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	48%	53%	60%	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	140 (0)	162 (0)	128 (0)	158 (0)	157 (0)	156 (0)	901 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
	2018	61%	49%	12%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	56%	50%	6%	56%	0%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	55%	61%	-6%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	44	50	43	44	31	31				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	26	38	24	43	58	31					
ASN	79	81		83	94						
BLK	41	41	52	57	55	27	46				
HSP	51	60	27	69	67	35	74				
MUL	57	56		76	67						
WHT	71	59	55	81	67		74				
FRL	42	50	52	61	60	34	56				
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	26	46	41	30	40	29	17				
ELL	26	56	69	43	53	45					
ASN	79	70		83	60		71				
BLK	41	52	54	47	50	33	46				
HSP	56	52	54	60	59		47				
MUL	67	39		79	72		75				
WHT	68	60	43	79	70	33	79				
FRL	48	48	53	53	54	33	48				
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	28	61	53	45	58	53	23				
ELL	26	50	55	53	63						
ASN	97	73		90	87						
BLK	45	56	67	51	52	37	54				
HSP	50	46	43	71	68	53	48				
MUL	59	70		63	78		50				
WHT	66	62	50	72	61	69	67				
FRL	47	60	58	51	52	47	46				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	84
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	46
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	56
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
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.

Students with Disabilities

Disproportionate number of ESE teachers to service identified students with disabilities.

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

English Language Learners

Increased number of students identified via WIDA testing with no increase in services or support.

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.

Math students in our Lowest Performing Quartile. 45 state average/34 school average

Lack of differentiation of instruction for identified students. Low attendance of LPQ (2 or more EWS).

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

Math Proficiency and Learning Gains.

Instruction implemented with fidelity. Strong core instruction.

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

Attendance (percentage of students missing 10 or more days) mainly in the younger grades has an adverse affect on academic achievement and strengthening the foundational skills.

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

1. English Language Learners
2. Students with Disabilities
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on our data, our goal is to focus on meeting the needs of our lowest performing quartile in both reading and math.
Rationale	The data shows a significant decline in gains of our lowest performing quartile of math students, as well as a steady decline of our lowest performing quartile of ELA students. Both have been attributed to a lack of implementation of differentiated small group instruction and interventions for students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA ELA LPQ Gains 58% (up 5% from 2019) FSA Math LPQ Gains 40% (up 8% from 2019)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of the Walk to Read and Walk to Math as a process of grouping students in skill-alike groups for a small portion of the day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will specialize in a particular skill level grouping during Walk to Read/Walk to Math and the students will "walk" to that group for targeted instruction. This will allow for more targeted, more efficient, more streamlined planning, instruction and assessment monitoring.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will participate in common planning/data discussion sessions with administration and specialists to review data from current formative/summative assessments to identify instruction needs and group students. 2. Teachers will work together during common planning to develop targeted lesson and assessments. 3. Teachers and admin will work together to analyze standards 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Collaborate more intentionally and frequently with all stakeholders to positively impact the culture and climate of the school community.
Rationale	Based on our data, we need to focus on strengthening the feeling of belonging among all stakeholders. We have decreased in feeling that opinions count, that someone at the school cares about them, and that parents receive regular updates.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	5Essentials Survey: Parent Involvement in School 26- Weak 2019 to 42 Neutral 2020 5Essentials Survey: Teacher-Principal Trust 34 Weak 2019 to 42 Neutral 2020 5Essentials survey: Teacher Influence 34 Weak 2019 to 42 Neutral 2020
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Robertson (robertsond@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Building authentic relationships among all stakeholders by improving the effectiveness of communication.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we collaborate more intentionally and frequently with all stakeholders (i.e. parents, students, teachers, and support staff), then a positive impact on the climate and culture of the school community will ultimately increase student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Culture Talks 2. Coffee with the Principal 3. Weekly school updates from the Principal using Blackboard system 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Denise Robertson (robertsond@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).

1. Invite business and faith-based partners to meet with school admin team to discuss ways in which our partnerships can strengthen our relationships and communication.
2. Develop a plan through which teachers are more supportive of student needs through class meetings and daily Sanford Harmony Meet Ups.
3. Review and enhance all modes of parent communication including but not limited to Blackboard, School Newsletter, agenda planners, and social media.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on our data, our goal is to focus on meeting the needs of our lowest performing quartile in both reading and math.	\$0.00
---	--------	---	---------------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Collaborate more intentionally and frequently with all stakeholders to positively impact the culture and climate of the school community.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00