Grasp Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Grasp Academy

3101 JUSTINA ROAD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/grasp

Demographics

Principal: Annessia Powell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: F (29%) 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

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.](http://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

Grasp Academy

3101 JUSTINA ROAD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/grasp

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)
Combination School 1-8	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year	2015-16
Grade	F

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

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.

GRASP MTSS Instructional Model provides a diverse set of teaching strategies and approaches based on Orton-Gillingham principles to address the needs of struggling readers (learners) focusing on students with dyslexia, dyscalculia and dysgraphia. The school incorporates project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Classroom instruction utilizes a variety of structured learning approaches, containing multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Resulting in excellence in every classroom, for every student, everyday.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and 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
Powell, Annessia	Principal	The GRASP Leadership Team (Instructional Implementation Team) consists a of Principal, Assistant Principal, Lead ESE teacher, elementary reading teacher & Guidance Counselor. The team meets weekly to discuss instructional practices, review and analyze assessment data and determine Professional Development needs for Staff. They also conduct paired walk-throughs or team walkthroughs at least 2x per month to build a shared understanding of strengths & needs within our school. At least two members from the leadership team will lead weekly PLCs with the teachers. These sessions are driven from the data & walk throughs. The topics will include professional development, review of student artifacts, student data analysis and support. This PLC model communicates, and leads the staff in the instructional focuses developed by the leadership team. The leadership team also has representation on the Shared Decision Making Team which meets at least monthly. Administration is responsible for monitoring and following up on the transferring of the professional development into the classroom setting through informal coaching & the evaluation system.
Smith, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Once a month, during the PLC time, the AP will lead grade level data discussions to look at student response to intervention. They will utilize classroom progress monitoring data, student work samples, grades, and school wide progress monitoring tools/data to determine student progress. Discussions and documentation will also center around research based interventions that are having an impact in the classroom for Tier 2 or for Tier 3 interventions. The leadership team will also look at data monthly regarding both academic & behavioral data to determine that school wide we are intervening with the right students. We will review students receiving multi-tiered support to determine if the student is able to move back into Tier 1, continue with Tier 2 interventions, or move to Tier 3 with intensive support. During the meeting there is also discussion of new students that have been identified during data review of needing additional support. We are also focusing on monitoring students who have shown low growth on previous state and district assessments. Students needing more support than currently can be provided within our model, may continue on to the formal Response to Intervention/Progress monitoring Team for formal

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		tracking of data and review to see if they need a more formalized plan. Data and the intervention needs will inform the leadership team and school accountability team of budgetary or staffing needs that are beyond our current structure. They will look at reallocating current needs, or seeking additional funding sources (support from the district level, grants, business partners, etc.) This includes overseeing the day to day operations of the school.

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	7	17	33	50	55	51	0	41	0	0	0	0	254
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	6	12	18	13	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	5	4	7	15	7	0	0	0	0	42
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	9	14	41	48	34	50	42	37	0	0	0	0	275

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	2	10	16	32	46	32	37	32	0	0	0	0	207

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
19

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 8/25/2019

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	5	5	17	19	18	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	2	5	1	13	9	2	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	8	20	51	39	51	36	48	11	0	0	0	0	264

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	9	20	41	34	37	40	40	13	0	0	0	0	234

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	0%	54%	61%	0%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	57%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	50%	56%	0%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	78%	0%	76%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	7 (0)	17 (0)	33 (0)	50 (0)	55 (0)	51 (0)	0 (0)	41 (0)	254 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	6 ()	12 ()	18 ()	13 ()	2 ()	4 ()	7 ()	64 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	7 (0)	15 (0)	7 (0)	42 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	9 (0)	14 (0)	41 (0)	48 (0)	34 (0)	50 (0)	42 (0)	37 (0)	275 (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	11%	51%	-40%	58%	-47%
	2018	14%	50%	-36%	57%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	6%	52%	-46%	58%	-52%
	2018	7%	49%	-42%	56%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-8%					
05	2019	29%	50%	-21%	56%	-27%
	2018	9%	51%	-42%	55%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison	20%					
Cohort Comparison	22%					
06	2019	8%	47%	-39%	54%	-46%
	2018	10%	44%	-34%	52%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
07	2019	9%	44%	-35%	52%	-43%
	2018	2%	41%	-39%	51%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison	7%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
08	2019	14%	49%	-35%	56%	-42%
	2018	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison	12%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	20%	61%	-41%	62%	-42%
	2018	20%	59%	-39%	62%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	4%	64%	-60%	64%	-60%
	2018	10%	60%	-50%	62%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	32%	57%	-25%	60%	-28%
	2018	34%	61%	-27%	61%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
06	2019	15%	51%	-36%	55%	-40%
	2018	10%	42%	-32%	52%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
07	2019	20%	47%	-27%	54%	-34%
	2018	16%	50%	-34%	54%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	31%	-31%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
	2018	36%	56%	-20%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	5%	40%	-35%	48%	-43%
	2018	24%	44%	-20%	50%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	24%	69%	-45%	71%	-47%
2018	20%	84%	-64%	71%	-51%
Compare		4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	57%	-19%	61%	-23%
2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	9	39	50	14	28	28	25	26			
BLK	4	39	65	8	27	28	21	18			
HSP	11	27		16	13						
WHT	17	45	46	23	36	36	27	26	33		
FRL	6	38	57	8	23	21	14	30			
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	278
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	17

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	32
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	25
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

The 2018-2019 4th grade math data showed the lowest performance scores at 4% proficiency. Contributing factors to this decline include; high teacher turn over rate, lack of professional development in the area of math and dyslexia.

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

The 2018-2019 math data showed a decrease in grades 4th grade math as well as 8th grade ELA both decreasing by 16% in each cohort. Factors contributing to this decline include teacher retention, absence of math coach to support new teachers as well as a systematic instructional plan.

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.

As an alternative school with below level students, our students have academic gains in Math and ELA below the state comparison with scores below 60% in the 4th grade cohort. Contributing factors include the lack of systematic and systemic intervention implementation and research based instructional strategies, lack of academic vocabulary as well as professional development in the area of mathematics, that are focused not just on proficiency but on student gains/growth towards closing gaps with peers.

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

The 2018-2019 5th grade ELA showed the most improvement with a 20% growth in this cohort. The following actions contributed to this growth; teacher retention, professional development in Orton-Gillingham, coaching in the Orton-Gillingham model.

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 the EWS data 22% of our student population missed 15 or more days of school last year.

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

1. Professional development
2. Teacher retention
3. Student Attendance
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with disabilities
Rationale	Students with disabilities have obtained a federal index score below 41% for two consecutive years. The current federal index is 27%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students with disabilities will show growth from a federal index score of 27% to a federal index score of 42% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction using Orton-Gillingham instruction in grades 3-5 to address decoding and fluency. Small group instruction using Corrective Reading instruction in grades 6-8 to address fluency and comprehension. Small group instruction using visualize and verbalize in grades 5-8 to address comprehension. Small group multi-sensory instruction in grades 1-5 to address math deficient. Instruction in Math 180 in grades 6-8 based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as inaccurate and labored decoding affecting comprehension; however since the student is bright he/she gets the "gist", misses the details or specifics; nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate, flies under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs. Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Orton-Gillingham principles, the only research methods to show results with students meeting the dyslexic profile.

Action Step	
Description	1. Professional development in standards based teaching. 2. Professional development in Multi Tiered System of Support (MTSS). 3. Professional development in Orton-Gillingham instruction. 4. Professional development in dyslexia, dyscalculia and dysgraphia. 5. Professional development in multi-sensory instruction as it relates to math.
Person Responsible	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Black/African American Students
Rationale	Black/African American Students scored below the 41% for two consecutive years on the Federal Index scoring 26% using this index.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Black/African American students will show growth from a federal index score of 26% to a federal index of 41% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction using Orton-Gillingham instruction in grades 3-5 to address decoding and fluency. Small group instruction using Corrective Reading instruction in grades 6-8 to address fluency and comprehension. Small group instruction using visualize and verbalize in grades 5-8 to address comprehension. Small group multi-sensory instruction in grades 1-5 to address math deficient. Instruction in Math 180 in grades 6-8 based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as inaccurate and labored decoding affecting comprehension; however since the student is bright he/she gets the "gist", misses the details or specifics; nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate, flies under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs. Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Orton-Gillingham principles, the only research methods to show results with students meeting the dyslexic profile.

Action Step	
Description	1. Differentiated small groups in the classroom for Tier 2 support of learning gaps using the MTSS model. 2. Differentiated small group instruction in Tier 3 for reading and math using the MTSS model. 3. Professional development in cultural diversity. 4. Monthly monitoring by the leadership team of students identified through the MTSS process. 5.
Person Responsible	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Hispanic Students
Rationale	Hispanic Students scored below the 41% for two consecutive years on the Federal Index scoring 17% using this index.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Hispanic students will show growth from a federal index score of 17% to a federal index of 42% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction using Orton-Gillingham instruction in grades 3-5 to address decoding and fluency. Small group instruction using Corrective Reading instruction in grades 6-8 to address fluency and comprehension. Small group instruction using visualize and verbalize in grades 5-8 to address comprehension. Small group multi-sensory instruction in grades 1-5 to address math deficient. Instruction in Math 180 in grades 6-8 based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as inaccurate and labored decoding affecting comprehension; however since the student is bright he/she gets the "gist", misses the details or specifics; nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate, flies under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs. Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Orton-Gillingham principles, the only research methods to show results with students meeting the dyslexic profile.

Action Step	
Description	1. Differentiated small groups in the classroom for Tier 2 support of learning gaps using the MTSS model. 2. Differentiated small group instruction in Tier 3 for reading and math using the MTSS model. 3. Professional development in cultural diversity. 4. Monthly monitoring by the leadership team/ESOL representative of students identified through the MTSS process. 5.
Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

#4	
Title	White Students
Rationale	White Students scored 32% on the Federal Index which is below the 41% benchmark.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	White students will show growth from a federal index score of 32% to a federal index score of 42% as indicated by state achievement test data in the areas of reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction using Orton-Gillingham instruction in grades 3-5 to address decoding and fluency. Small group instruction using Corrective Reading instruction in grades 6-8 to address fluency and comprehension. Small group instruction using visualize and verbalize in grades 5-8 to address comprehension. Small group multi-sensory instruction in grades 1-5 to address math deficient. Instruction in Math 180 in grades 6-8 based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as inaccurate and labored decoding affecting comprehension; however since the student is bright he/she gets the "gist", misses the details or specifics; nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate, flies under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs. Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Orton-Gillingham principles, the only research methods to show results with students meeting the dyslexic profile.

Action Step	
Description	1. Professional development in standards based teaching. 2. Professional development in the MTSS process and using data to make decisions. 3. Professional development in dyslexia, dyscalculia and dysgraphia. 4. Professional development in multi-sensory instruction as it relates to math. 5. Professional development in multi-sensory instruction as it relates to reading.
Person Responsible	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

#5	
Title	Economically disadvantaged Students
Rationale	Economically Disadvantaged Students have obtained a federal index score below 41% for two consecutive years. The current federal index is 25%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Economically Disadvantaged Students will show growth from a federal index score of 25% to a federal index score of 42% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction using Orton-Gillingham instruction in grades 3-5 to address decoding and fluency. Small group instruction using Corrective Reading instruction in grades 6-8 to address fluency and comprehension. Small group instruction using visualize and verbalize in grades 5-8 to address comprehension. Small group multi-sensory instruction in grades 1-5 to address math deficient. Instruction in Math 180 in grades 6-8 based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as inaccurate and labored decoding affecting comprehension; however since the student is bright he/she gets the "gist", misses the details or specifics; nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate, flies under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs. Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Orton-Gillingham principles, the only research methods to show results with students meeting the dyslexic profile.

Action Step	
Description	1. Professional development in multi-sensory math. 2. Implement intervention schedule through the MTSS process for students who are currently struggling in math. 3. Weekly data review of I-Ready reading and math. 4. Teachers will utilize Orton-Gillinham strategies to intervene during small group instruction in decoding and fluency. 5. Orton-Gillingham professional development will be administered and staff will be provided ongoing support during weekly coaching sessions.
Person Responsible	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

#6	
Title	Climate & Culture
Rationale	When students were asked to complete the 5Essentials survey, administered in 2019, regarding a supportive environment in school they reported the following aspects of a supportive school environment: Students feel safe in and around the school 20 out of 100 Students find teachers trust-worthy 40 out of 100

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of Students will report that they feel safe in their environment on the 5Essentials survey. 90% of Students will report that they find teachers trust-worthy on the 5Essentials survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The systemic and systematic Implementation of positive behavior support strategies (PBIS) including restorative justice, increase of small group social skills and building of positive staff interactions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as inaccurate and labored decoding affecting comprehension; however since the student is bright he/she gets the "gist", misses the details or specifics; nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate, flies under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs. Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Orton-Gillingham principles, the only research methods to show results with students meeting the dyslexic profile.

Action Step	
Description	1. Establish a building wide PBIS team to build a positive culture and climate. 2. Develop a schedule for small group social skills groups. 3. Professional Development on the social emotional needs of students with Dyslexia. 4. Professional Development focusing on building positive relationship between teachers and students. 5. Weekly implementation of a mental health curriculum in grades 1-8
Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@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 V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Black/African American Students	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Hispanic Students	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: White Students	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Economically disadvantaged Students	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Climate & Culture	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**