Venetia Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Venetia Elementary School

4300 TIMUQUANA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/venetia

Demographics

Principal: Monique Chatman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	74%
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 (63%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (57%)
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

Venetia Elementary School

4300 TIMUQUANA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/venetia

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	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

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

Venetia Elementary School of the Medical Arts provides a well-balanced, rigorous curriculum designed to meet the academic and social needs of individual students as well as create an environment that supports an interest in the medical fields.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Venetia Elementary School of the Medical Arts is to provide students with opportunities to explore practices, subjects, and experiences in academic and medical fields as well as inspire and provide rigorous preparation for students to continue their exploration in the Medical Arts Middle School program and beyond as healthy, productive citizens of our society.

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
Worthen, Monique	Principal	
Kirkland, Katherine	Assistant Principal	

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	85	71	84	69	57	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	433
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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)
22

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/31/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

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	52%	50%	57%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	62%	63%	65%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	63%	62%	71%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	51%	67%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	48%	53%	59%	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	85 (0)	71 (0)	84 (0)	69 (0)	57 (0)	67 (0)	433 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	0 ()	4 ()	4 ()	10 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (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	59%	51%	8%	58%	1%
	2018	56%	50%	6%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
	2018	46%	49%	-3%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	49%	50%	-1%	56%	-7%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	54%	61%	-7%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
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	17	50	64	21	39	36	27				
BLK	48	62	71	59	75	58	41				
HSP	48	33		59	79		60				
MUL	56	80		67	73						
WHT	59	64		80	81		86				
FRL	41	54	67	56	70	47	51				
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	56	50	17	33	18					
BLK	45	43	56	46	39	24	60				
HSP	58	65		62	41						
MUL	67			60							
WHT	59	59		70	34		79				
FRL	46	51	61	55	41	23	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	39	53		36	47						
BLK	46	48	53	55	61	56	54				
HSP	55	67		52	50						
WHT	66	71		78	82	90	60				
FRL	49	58	55	55	63	65	58				

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	63
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	59
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	69
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	74
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	55
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.

ELA achievement showed the lowest overall performance. There are trends of ELA Achievement declining by two percentage points each year. These students were exposed to a curriculum with limited passages for reading in the primary grades. We have experienced students not reading on grade level but are making gains in their reading ability.

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

Science showed the greatest decline. The reading proficiency of this particular group of students was much lower than that of the previous year's group, with 47 percent proficiency in 4th grade and 46 percent proficiency in 5th grade.

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.

ELA achievement has the greatest gap with the school 5 percent lower than the state average. This was also true the previous year. The amount of time provided for independent reading with practice of a specific skill could be a contributing factor. We also notice that stamina of reading for 80 minutes is a factor.

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

Math Lowest 25 percentile showed the greatest gains. Overall, math gains increased significantly. Drilling down data and providing targeted supports to students based on their individual data. Also consistent small group support with a instructional paraprofessional.

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

The attendance of these students can be a concern. Frequent absences could contribute to their academic performance.

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

1. ELA achievement
2. Science achievement
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA achievement
Rationale	The ELA achievement has declined over time and has been the lowest domain in previous years.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	60 percent of students in grades 3 - 5 will score a level 3 or higher on the 2020 Florida State Assessment for their grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide consistent small group instruction for students based on individual student data using research-based instructional materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we provide consistent small-group instruction, based on student data, then we will better meet student needs and fill learning gaps.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administration will facilitate common planning with teachers using planning and data analysis protocols for monitoring student data and planning small group instruction. 2. Teachers will consistently meet with targeted groups of students to provide targeted instructional support. 3. Teachers and administration will select and determine research-based materials to be used during small group instruction. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Our 5th grade science score declined significantly from the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	70 percent of students in 5th grade will score a level 3 or higher on the NGSSS Science assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Katherine Kirkland (kirklandk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide targeted small group instruction for students based on their individual data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we provide consistent small-group instruction, based on student data, then students will increase their overall learning of the content matter.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administration will facilitate common planning using planning and data analysis protocols for monitoring student data and planning small group instruction. 2. The teacher will consistently meet with targeted groups of students to provide differentiated instructional support. 3. Teacher and administration will select and determine research-based materials to be used during small group instruction. 4. Teacher will provide differentiated learning tasks for students based on demonstrated need. 5.
Person Responsible	Katherine Kirkland (kirklandk@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).