

Duval County Public Schools

Mt. Herman ESE Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Mt. Herman ESE Center

1741 FRANCIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

Demographics

Principal: Moses Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 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.

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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Mt. Herman ESE Center

1741 FRANCIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

Year
Grade

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.

Our mission is to provide an environment that will maximize the potential of our students by providing challenging, realistic and functional goals in the areas of:

Academic Growth
Communication
Independent Functioning
Social Skills

We strive to cultivate awareness and acceptance and to provide a smooth transition into society that will improve the quality of life for students and their families.

Provide the school's vision statement.

“Learning to Live Life and Live it Abundantly”

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
Wilson, Tina	Principal	The role of a Principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. Also, the Principal has to ensure the safety of all who enter the building.
Mcdomick, Joseph	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in interviewing and evaluating instructional and non-instructional staff. Help create school-wide goals including those related to student learning and student behavior. Meeting with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning goals. Initiate and document Emergency Drills. Enforcing school rules. Upload Title 1 documents and anything else that the Principal deems necessary.
Take, Matthew	Instructional Coach	Their role of the Instructional Coach is to help reflect on instruction and collaborate as teachers encourage positive change in the school culture, promote the use of data analysis to inform best teaching practices.
Todd, Yvonne	School Counselor	The role of the School Counselor is to build good relationships between the parents, teachers and students. She is responsible for scheduling the MRT meetings and she helps to coordinate workshops that are beneficial to our parents.
Roziere, Julie	Teacher, Adult	The primary goal of the Transition Program Teacher is to provide specialized instruction in an individualized program for students in order to empower them to become happy, confident and productive members of their community.
Thomason, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	The job duties and responsibilities of the ESE CSS Site Coach are to: mentor and to provide support to the teachers, schedule training's for their Professional Development and to help them with writing Individualized Education Program (IEP).

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	3	8	10	10	4	6	12	11	9	9	11	9	41	143
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	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	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	0

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/1/2019

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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	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	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	3 (0)	8 (0)	10 (0)	10 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	12 (0)	11 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	11 (0)	9 (0)	41 (0)	143 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	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)	0 (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)	0 (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)	0 (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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
2018					

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					
2018					

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		27			19						
BLK		24			21						
WHT		38									
FRL		29			25						

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	8
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	46
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	87%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	8
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	9
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	13
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	11
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.

African American males showed the lowest performance. This is possibly due to low attendance and low parent involvement.

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

N/A

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; This is possibly due to student difficulty with communication. Most students are pre-communication skills. These skills are necessary to be proficient in ELA.

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

ELA proficiency has increased by 3% because of additional focus on evidence based instruction and increased focus on communication and prompting.

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

Our continued greatest area of concern is student communication. Without expressive communication skills, students are not able to indicate wants/needs or make choices to impact their learning and independent skills.

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

1. Communication Skills
2. School Based Enterprise
3. Increased Student Attendance (Outreach)
4. Increased Family Participation
5. Increased Professional Development

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Communication and Literacy

Rationale Our student population has severe cognitive disabilities. As a result of their disability they have limited cognition, and commonly communicate with gestures, eye gaze, purposeful moving to objects and sounds. Our goal is to build upon the student's current methods of communication by introducing voice output devices, assistive technology and concrete objects. Classroom equipment, technology and supplies require regular maintenance because they are subject to normal wear and tear.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Increased scores or maintenance of skills on FSAA, PLA district exam, Mt. Herman Pre-Post "Communication Exam" and accomplished IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Matthew Take (takem@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Systematic Instruction, Small Group instruction with the use of Visual Supports and Concrete Objects.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Systemic instructional trials are inserted in the ongoing natural routines of students throughout the day. Thereby not interrupting daily schedules. These trails can be review by the teacher periodically and modified to meet individual student needs. Teacher data serves as the evidence needed to determine if the student is responsive to communication device and will also determine if another device is more appropriate.

Action Step

Description

1. Assess Student (Mt. Herman Pre-Test on "Communication")
2. Meet with Instructional Coach to review results
3. Trial Prescribed Communication Methods
4. Record Results
5. Modify devices and/or Methods if needed

Person Responsible Matthew Take (takem@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Parent and Family Development
Rationale	Parents have the unique challenge when navigating how to partner with schools to achieve student success. The services for students with severe cognitive disabilities are obscure and limited. So, we help to bridge the gap between the school and the needs of the family.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increased parent and family attendance at workshops and training sessions. It provides the parents the necessary tools to promote the student's academic achievement and supports the caregiver's needs for personal and individual growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joseph Mcdomick (mcdomickj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Parent and Family Engagement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	There is a direct correlation between the success of the student and the involvement of the student's family. The family needs to be knowledgeable of the strategies used at school, have access to those resources and be a willing partner in accomplishing student goals.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employ a Volunteer Liaison and a Parent Liaison 2. Collect and assess parent needs 3. Arrange teacher/parent data chats, conferences, workshops and classroom observations 4. Organize parent training and provide materials to support home learning 5.
Person Responsible	Joseph Mcdomick (mcdomickj@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Student Engagement
Rationale	Increasing student engagement would therefore increase the opportunities to learn and to grow. We are putting forth a concerted effort to increase the home and school relationship, so that there is a mutual exchange of strategies and techniques.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The outcomes will be measured via: Task Data Sheets, Mt. Herman Pre and Post Tests, FSA Testing, District Assessments and Teacher-Created Tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matthew Take (takem@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data Driven, Individualized, Teacher-Differentiated Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The data will let us know if the student regressed, remained the same or improved.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create individualized task data sheets 2. Develop appropriate strategies for increasing student engagement 3. Implement appropriate strategies for increasing student engagement 4. Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies and make adjustments as needed based on the data. 5.
Person Responsible	Tina Wilson (wilsont3@duvalschools.org)

#4	
Title	Economically Disadvantaged Students
Rationale	11% of our Economically Disadvantaged students are proficient which is 30% below the federal index.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students who are Economically Disadvantaged will show growth of 30% as measure by the proficiency and learning gains made on Florida State Alternate Assessment in grades 3-12 in reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joseph Mcdomick (mcdomickj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Systematic Instruction, Small Group instruction with the use of Visual Supports and Concrete Objects.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Systemic instructional trials are inserted in the ongoing natural routines of students throughout the day. Thereby not interrupting daily schedules. These trails can be review by the teacher periodically and modified to meet individual student needs. Teacher data serves as the evidence needed to determine if the student is responsive to communication device and will also determine if another device is more appropriate.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess Student (Mt. Herman Pre-Test on "Communication") 2. Meet with Instructional Coach to review results 3. Trial Prescribed Communication Methods 4. Record Results 5. Modify devices and/or Methods if needed
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5	
Title	White Students
Rationale	13% of white students are proficient which is 28% below the federal index.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students who are white will show growth of 28% as measure by the proficiency and learning gains made on Florida State Alternate Assessment in grades 3-12 in reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joseph Mcdomick (mcdomickj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Systematic Instruction, Small Group instruction with the use of Visual Supports and Concrete Objects.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Systemic instructional trials are inserted in the ongoing natural routines of students throughout the day. Thereby not interrupting daily schedules. These trails can be review by the teacher periodically and modified to meet individual student needs. Teacher data serves as the evidence needed to determine if the student is responsive to communication device and will also determine if another device is more appropriate.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess Student (Mt. Herman Pre-Test on "Communication") 2. Meet with Instructional Coach to review results 3. Trial Prescribed Communication Methods 4. Record Results 5. Modify devices and/or Methods if needed
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#6	
Title	Black/African American Students
Rationale	9% of Black/African American Students are proficient which is 32% the federal index.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students who are Black/African American will show growth of 32% as measure by the proficiency and learning gains made on Florida State Alternate Assessment in grades 3-12 in reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joseph Mcdomick (mcdomickj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Systematic Instruction, Small Group instruction with the use of Visual Supports and Concrete Objects.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Systemic instructional trials are inserted in the ongoing natural routines of students throughout the day. Thereby not interrupting daily schedules. These trails can be review by the teacher periodically and modified to meet individual student needs. Teacher data serves as the evidence needed to determine if the student is responsive to communication device and will also determine if another device is more appropriate.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess Student (Mt. Herman Pre-Test on "Communication") 2. Meet with Instructional Coach to review results 3. Trial Prescribed Communication Methods 4. Record Results 5. Modify devices and/or Methods if needed
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#7

Title Students with Disabilities

Rationale 8% of Students with Disabilities are proficient which is 33% below the federal index.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Students who are Black/African American will show growth of 33% as measure by the proficiency and learning gains made on Florida State Alternate Assessment in grades 3-12 in reading and math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Matthew Take (takem@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Systematic Instruction, Small Group instruction with the use of Visual Supports and Concrete Objects.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Systemic instructional trials are inserted in the ongoing natural routines of students throughout the day. Thereby not interrupting daily schedules. These trails can be review by the teacher periodically and modified to meet individual student needs. Teacher data serves as the evidence needed to determine if the student is responsive to communication device and will also determine if another device is more appropriate.

Action Step

- Description**
1. Assess Student (Mt. Herman Pre-Test on "Communication")
 2. Meet with Instructional Coach to review results
 3. Trial Prescribed Communication Methods
 4. Record Results
 5. Modify devices and/or Methods if needed

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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 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.

Mt. Herman ESC will offer workshops and training sessions to parents, guardians and stakeholders throughout the year. Some of them include: Fundamentals of Writing an IEP, Adapt-A-Book for Special Needs Children and Strategies to Re-Shape Behaviors.

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.

Mt. Herman ESC offers a variety of support systems to our students. We have a full-time staff of 6 nurses, and a battery of Physical Therapists, Occupational Therapists, Visual Therapists and Speech Therapists.

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

When students enter Mt. Herman ESC, all interested parties are given a tour of the building by the school counselor, issued a Parent/Student Handbook and both parties are made aware of the mutual expectations involved in educating the new student.

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.

At Mt. Herman ESC, the Leadership Team meets every Friday to discuss the "Glows and Grows." Team members are responsible for communicating the needs and desires of their specific classrooms on Fridays. Mr. Take is our Instructional Coach and he is responsible for making sure the needs of the teachers are met.

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

Mt. Herman ESC has a very supportive list of Business Partners. They provide blankets, backpacks, food, clothing, iPads and large monetary donations to re-do our playground and to update our gym equipment. Also, we have a great relationship with the Jacksonville Sheriff Office.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Communication and Literacy				\$12,782.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5200	620-Audio Visual Materials (Non-consumable)	1641 - Mt. Herman ESE Center	Title, I Part A		\$6,782.00
	5200	640-Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	1641 - Mt. Herman ESE Center	Title, I Part A		\$6,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Parent and Family Development				\$26,803.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	6100	100-Salaries	1641 - Mt. Herman ESE Center	Title, I Part A		\$22,840.00	
	6100	200-Employee Benefits	1641 - Mt. Herman ESE Center	Title, I Part A		\$3,963.00	
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Engagement					\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Economically Disadvantaged Students					\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: White Students					\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Black/African American Students					\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
					Total:	\$39,585.00	