

Duval County Public Schools

Waterleaf Elementary



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

Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Brady Hewitt G

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: B (58%)
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

Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

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	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

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.

Waterleaf Elementary School develops inquisitive, independent thinkers and collaborative learners, who acquire the essential knowledge necessary to be career and college ready, and to be caring and creative contributors to the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Waterleaf Elementary School will foster an earnest passion for learning that inspires students to work with others in creating a better world for all.

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
Bergfeld, Kimberly	Teacher, ESE	Teaches Gifted students; Leadership team
Brady Hewitt, Lisa	Principal	
Price, Susan	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Attendance below 90 percent	22	20	16	14	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15	51	37	50	42	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262	

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	2	5	28	25	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	

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	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	7	10	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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

50

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	24	27	22	14	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	17	20	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide assessment	11	31	26	41	64	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238

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	16	35	27	27	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

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	64%	50%	57%	65%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	63%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	42%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	62%	63%	75%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	74%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	54%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 ()	20 ()	16 ()	14 ()	8 ()	16 ()	96 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	4 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 ()	2 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15 ()	51 (0)	37 (0)	50 (0)	42 (0)	67 (0)	262 (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	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
	2018	69%	50%	19%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	62%	50%	12%	56%	6%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	61%	10%	62%	9%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	30	44	27	40	46	34	39				
ELL	41	63	53	55	74	58	42				
ASN	76	58		90	71		73				
BLK	52	54	27	59	54	32	41				
HSP	58	59	50	58	67	50	53				
MUL	69	50		75	75						
WHT	67	64	50	74	61	53	74				
FRL	55	53	41	61	58	35	48				
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	32	41	37	49	60	57	52				
ELL	40	42	33	60	37						
ASN	82	66		96	79		88				
BLK	52	43	35	50	43	35	37				
HSP	57	60	47	66	59	54	62				
MUL	68	69		82	53						

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
WHT	71	62	43	84	66	56	83				
FRL	55	50	38	64	56	41	58				
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	51	40	50	61	52	29				
ELL	38	44	38	67	56						
ASN	67	75		86	88		75				
BLK	58	61	41	61	73	67	60				
HSP	47	49	38	64	54	38	38				
MUL	63	50		88	72						
WHT	75	71	38	82	80	58	67				
FRL	54	53	42	66	70	52	49				

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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	57
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	71
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	59
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	67
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	63
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.

Lowest performance was in ELA BQ at 43% and Math BQ at 44%. Contributing factors:

**Most of our BQ are ESE and the student to teacher ratio in ESE was very high.

**Teacher left in Oct.; substitute until a certified teacher was found.

**Tier III materials were scarce due to lack of funds.

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

Greatest decline was in Math Proficiency. We declined by 5 points from 75% to 70%.

**5th grade dropped from 72% in 2018 to 58% in 2019 due to teacher absence throughout the year.

**i-Ready scores did not indicate such a drop.

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 gaps between the school and the state were BQ in ELA and Math.

**Lack of Tier III materials

**Teacher issues (ESE substitute/Math teacher absence)

**All new teachers in 4th grade ELA.

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

Gains in Math Proficiency and Gains in ELA BQ. New actions were intensive small group instruction.

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

Level 1 on the state wide assessments. We have a large number of students who score a level one, but are promoted due to growth.

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

1. Gains in Reading
2. Gains in Math
3. Gains
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA BQ Gains
Rationale	Gains in ELA BQ groups are below expectations. Students in the Lowest Performing Group should be making a years worth of growth each year and a large percentage are not obtaining that goal.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA BQ Gains will increase 10 points from 43% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students in the ELA BQ will receive intensive intervention through Rtl daily for a minimum of 20 minutes. Rtl will consist of small groups (2-5) and will use intervention materials based on individual need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students have not been receiving targeted intervention on a daily basis. Rtl is research-based and, done with fidelity, will increase a student's growth. Criteria is based on scores on several assessments (i-Ready; Achieve 3000, District Benchmarks, FSA). These are used to place students into intervention groups. Resources are materials provided by the district (i-Ready; Achieve 3000; BAS; LLI; Phonics for Reading.)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect data from diagnostics in Aug. (i-Ready; Achieve 3000; Benchmark assessments) 2. Analyze the data to form groups 3. Form groups based on individual need.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Schedule an Rtl block for each grade level and provide extra assistance to ensure small group size. 5. Implement Rtl and monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth 6. Analyze data; create new groups; continue the process
Person Responsible	Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math BQ Gains
Rationale	Gains in Math BQ groups are below expectations. Students in the Lowest Performing Group should be making a years worth of growth each year and a large percentage are not obtaining that goal.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math BQ Gains will increase 10 points from 44% to 54%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Susan Price (prices1@duvalschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Tier III instruction will take place for students in the BQ in Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Tier III instruction will give students opportunities to learn strategies and components that were missed prior to this year. Small, standards based groups will increase growth. Resources such as i-Ready and extra tutors will be used to provide instruction based on need.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect data from diagnostics in Aug. (i-Ready; Benchmark assessments) 2. Analyze the data to form groups 3. Form groups based on individual need. 4. Schedule an RtI block for each grade level and provide extra assistance to ensure small group size. 5. Implement RtI and monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth 6. Analyze data; create new groups; continue the process
Person Responsible	Susan Price (prices1@duvalschool.org)

#3	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	SWD are below 41% on ESSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SWD will increase from 37% on ESSA to 41% or above.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	SWD will receive intensive intervention through Rtl daily for a minimum of 20 minutes. Rtl will consist of small groups (2-5 students) and will use intervention materials based on individual need. This will be in addition to their IEP goals and their time spent with their ESE teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Rtl is research-based and, done with fidelity, will increase a student's growth. Criteria is based on scores on several assessments (i-Ready; Achieve 3000, District Benchmarks, FSA). These are used to place students into intervention groups. Resources are materials provided by the district (i-Ready; Achieve 3000; BAS; LLI; Phonics for Reading.)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect data from diagnostics in Aug. (i-Ready; Achieve 3000; Benchmark assessments) 2. Analyze the data to form groups 3. Form groups based on individual need. 4. Schedule an Rtl block for each grade level and provide extra assistance to ensure small group size. 5. Implement Rtl and monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth 6. Analyze data; create new groups; continue the process
Person Responsible	Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@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).

Safety: All teachers and staff will be equipped with a personal communication device (walkie) for the safety of all students and adults.

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.

Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA BQ Gains	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math BQ Gains	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00