

Duval County Public Schools

Kings Trail Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Kings Trail Elementary School

7401 OLD KINGS RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32217

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

Demographics

Principal: Sanethette Shubert S

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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 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	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Kings Trail Elementary School

7401 OLD KINGS RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32217

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">85%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 challenge our learners to reach global standards through engaging experiences and motivating opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kings Trail is a dedicated learning community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shubert, Sanethette	Principal	<p>The Principal will provide leadership and administration which will motivate instructional and support personnel to strive for superior performance so as to provide the best possible opportunities for student growth and development, both educationally and personally.</p> <p>The principal will maintain an environment that is safe and inviting for all students. Evaluations of staff and faculty are done by her to provide improvement to their professional practices. She will provide a behavioral system that is fair and promotes restorative justice. Ms. Shubert evaluates the social, emotional, and educational needs of the students in the building based on current data. She will help all teachers to implement the Florida Standards which strategically point students to being College and Career ready. Students are challenged by her to reach their highest potential.</p> <p>Ms. Shubert is involved in the professional development of our staff and faculty. This professional development will be focused on developing the understanding and implementation of Ready Reading, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Eureka Math, Acaletics, Science, and the Florida Standards for all content areas.</p> <p>Ms. Shubert will communicate with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities. She develops, articulates, and uses a shared vision of instructional excellence to guide and define decisions.</p>
DeWalt, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	<p>Lindsay Dewalt (Assistant Principal) will assist in the development of teachers through consistent, bite-sized feedback to improve instruction and classroom environments for all students. She will assist in the development and implementation of procedures and systems to provide a safe environment for all students, staff, and stakeholders.</p>
Whigham, Derrick	Instructional Coach	<p>Derrick Whigam (Math Coach) supports the professional growth of school mathematics teachers by developing content knowledge. He will enhance math instruction and student growth through the use of student data. Will collaborate with teachers to target students specific needs to drive instruction and center activities. He will support teachers in the implementation of Eureka Math, Acaletics, and blended learning centers.</p>
Rodriguez, Crystal	Instructional Coach	<p>Crystal Rodriguez (Reading Coach) supports the professional growth of English Language Arts teachers by developing content knowledge and implementation of Ready Reading, Corrective Reading, and Reading Mastery. She will enhance reading instruction through the use of data to group students and drive instructional planning. She will facilitate professional learning communities on the reading process and guided reading (teacher led) and other data driven literacy centers.</p>
Sanchez, Courtney	School Counselor	<p>Mrs. Sanchez provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, the school guidance counselor continues</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. The school counselor also assists in supporting teachers with the Rtl process by meeting with teachers weekly to provide support for intervention fidelity, documentation, curriculum selection and more. As school counselor she also, helps to monitor or students with IEP's to make sure they are receiving services that are allocated through their plan. She will ensure Cumulative folders are maintained and contain recent information on students with disabilities.

Staves, Allison	Teacher, K-12	Allison Staves serves as a fifth grade teacher and lead science teacher. In this role, she coordinates and monitors focus standards and assists in lesson planning for K-5 science teachers at Kings Trail. In addition, she will work with novice teachers on identified areas of improvement. As the lead science teacher, she also serves as science fair coordinator in order to ensure that district and state guidelines are met.
-----------------	---------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Kristina, Stars	Teacher, K-12	Kristina Stars (ELA Lead) supports the professional growth of English Language Arts teachers by assisting with instruction and in the Professional Development for fellow faculty and staff by aiding the Reading Coach, Crystal Rodriguez.
-----------------	---------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Al-Jaroudi, Yousef	Teacher, K-12	Yousef Al-Jaroudi (Math Interventionist) provides direct support to classroom teachers by working with the lowest performing quartile students. He will provide professional development to support the classroom teacher. As well as guide and support teachers with mathematic instruction driven by student data. He will assist with the implementation of math programs such as Acaletics, i-Ready, and Eureka Math to ensure they reach the rigor of Florida's math state standards.
--------------------	---------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Clervaux, Constance	Teacher, ESE	As Lead ESE/VE Teacher I am responsible for the proper development and implementation of all student IEPs, grades PK-5 and work alongside district personnel, school administration, staff and all classroom teachers in support of all ESE students.
---------------------	--------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Sanethette Shubert S

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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 .	

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	60	57	62	70	65	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	22	12	12	13	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	45	46	50	37	23	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	47	44	49	39	20	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229

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	44	42	48	35	18	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
Number of students enrolled	50	47	64	69	69	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	392
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	
Number of students enrolled	50	47	64	69	69	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	392
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	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	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	42%	50%	57%	38%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	50%	53%	52%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	53%	62%	63%	49%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	63%	62%	38%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	51%	36%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	48%	53%	32%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
	2018	40%	50%	-10%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
	2018	24%	51%	-27%	55%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	61%	-2%	62%	-3%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	64%	-16%	64%	-16%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	35%	57%	-22%	60%	-25%
	2018	39%	61%	-22%	61%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison				-4%		
Cohort Comparison				-25%		

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	49%	-8%	53%	-12%
	2018	38%	56%	-18%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison				3%		
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	27	33	36	27	48	30					
ELL	30	51	39	49	54	53	47				
ASN	54			85							
BLK	36	44	27	42	48	50	41				
HSP	40	56	44	56	49	42	41				
WHT	59	63		63	71						
FRL	40	53	41	53	50	46	52				
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	35		27	47						
ELL	27	52	43	48	61	56	15				
ASN	33			58							
BLK	38	49		48	48	23	30				
HSP	37	54	46	59	67	69	29				
MUL	77	70		46	60						
WHT	68	41		71	65						
FRL	45	53	44	59	63	44	38				
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	14	33		27	50						
ELL	13	40	38	38	38	42	17				
ASN	20	46		43	42						
BLK	44	55		41	29	42	7				
HSP	27	43	55	49	43		42				

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
MUL	60			70							
WHT	52	50		57	38						
FRL	40	49	50	47	32	33	32				

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	49
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	65
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (39%) was the lowest performance area. A contributing factor to this was the students needed more intensive Tier III instruction to target their individual needs. Another contributing factor is the teachers need more understanding of how to teach the foundational skills of reading. Professional development in the area of the Phonics Continuum could help increase student data in this component area.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (39%) should the largest decline from the prior year as this component declined 9% points. a contributing factor to this decline was the ELA fourth grade teachers were both first-year teachers. The reading interventionist focused on third grade and fifth-grade students which left a gap in fourth grade. The fourth-grade students needed more intensive support in reading and the fourth grade ELA teachers needed more professional development. The school did not have a Reading Coach during the 2018-2019 school year.

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 (42%) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There was a difference of 15% points between the school's average and the state's average. Literacy has been a major needs area in the school. Over 50% of students are performing two years or more below their current grade levels. The school needs an intensive reading intervention program that focuses on the foundational skills of reading for students in grades KG-5th. The program needs to be consistent year to year to determine true program effectiveness for the students. i.e Reading Mastery and Corrective

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

Science Achievement (49%) showed the most improvement, increasing by 10 percentage points from the prior year. A new teacher was placed in 5th grade Science, the teacher only taught Science to all fifth-grade students. An emphasis was placed on conducting demonstration lessons weekly allowing students to participate in investigations during the school day. In addition, two blended learning platforms were used with fidelity focused solely on Science, i.e, Penda and Study Island). The ELA and Science teachers planned together and the ELA teacher when teaching informational reading standards would include topics from science.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students with Disabilities is an area of concern as the data shows only 34% of the students are achieving proficiency in the area of reading. Another area of concern is the Black/African American students, the students are at 44% which is greater than the threshold of 41% but not at the level of achievement we would like for the students to be performing at.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Lowest Performing Quartile Gains (Math and ELA)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lowest Performing Quartile Gains: According to the data, the Lowest Performing Quartile Gains decreased in both ELA and Math. In ELA, the LPQ Gains dropped nine percentage points from 48 in 17-18 to 39 in 18-19. In Math, the LPQ Gains decreased six percentage points from 53 in 17-18 to 47 points in 18-19. After analyzing the data there is a need to focus on LPQ student performance in both ELA and Math.

If Kings Trail Elementary School teachers increase the use of consistent data-driven, standards-based, differentiated Tier II instruction aligned to the Florida Standards, lowest-performing quartile student gains will increase in both reading and math.

Measurable Outcome: The following are the outcomes that our school plans to achieve:
 1. Increase our Lowest Performing Quartile Gains in ELA from 39 points to 58 points as evidenced by FSA data.
 2. Increase our Lowest Performing Quartile Gains in Math from 47 points to 63 points as evidenced by FSA data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sanethette Shubert (shuberts@duvalschools.org)

- Instructional Coach Positions for both math and reading will be purchased/used to help LPQ students make gains and/or become proficient in Math and Reading. Additionally, the Math and Reading Coaches will work with specific LPQ students twice a week for thirty minutes to improve the students' proficiency of targeted standards based on student data/needs.
- A Math Interventionist position will be purchased to help LPQ students and students close to achieving proficiency in math.
- Acaletics, a supplemental material will be used in all 3rd - 5th-grade classrooms to support student learning in the area of math. This supplemental curriculum will be implemented daily.

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Tutoring opportunities will be provided through a Saturday School platform for students.
- Freckle ELA and Math, a blended learning platform will be used as an additional support for LPQ students in both ELA and Math. The instructional coaches will monitor LPQ student growth throughout the program use and modifications will be made bi-weekly to support student learning tracks.
- Weekly PLCs and common planning sessions will occur allowing 50 minutes per session for teachers to plan and review student work. Teachers will develop student tasks and assessments that are aligned to the Florida standards during common planning sessions as well. Instructional coaches and administration will lead professional development during the weekly PLCs to strengthen teacher knowledge of standards using the learning arc template for planning.
- Corrective Learning, a researched-based reading intervention program will be used with all LPQ students to enhance their foundational reading skills. Students will engage in the program for forty-five minutes daily by a teacher trained specifically in the program.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

- Interventionists work extensively with students to help them improve specific reading/math skills.
- It is important for the interventionists and tutors to have the right materials to support students with their learning deficits.
- Bridging gaps for students who are behind grade-level takes time beyond the ELA and Math block.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop faculty's knowledge of how to effectively identify student learning needs based on data from all assessments.
2. Use data to identify the LPQ students that the interventionist and tutors will target.
3. Leverage formal and informal assessments to measure the effectiveness of the interventions being used by both the interventionist and tutors.
4. Monitor interventionist and tutor schedules and lesson plans to ensure that interventions are being implemented with fidelity.
5. Conduct weekly common planning sessions focused on learning and planning for teachers using grade specific standards.

**Person
Responsible** Sanethette Shubert (shuberts@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our needs analysis, the federal index for the student with disabilities subgroup SWD is below 41 percent.

Measurable Outcome: If Kings Trail teachers differentiate learning for students with disabilities aligning instruction and instructional materials with the goals and objectives of the individual educational plans then the federal index for students with disabilities will increase from 34 percent to 45 percent as evidenced by the Florida State Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lindsay DeWalt (dewaltl@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Leverage ESE teacher(s) to help struggling students make gains and/or become proficient readers. Additionally, the ESE teacher(s) will work alongside teachers to help students with disabilities improve specific reading skills based on data. Reading Mastery and/or Corrective curriculums will be used with the students to strengthen their foundational reading skills. Both programs are researched-based reading programs.
- Additional supplemental reading materials will be used to support students with disabilities during reading center blocks. These materials include Reading A to Z and FCRR lessons.
- The use of blended learning platforms iReady, Achieve, and Freckle ELA to support the learning of the students.

Study Island will be purchased to support learners' literacy and science for informational standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- ESE teachers, work extensively with students to help them improve specific reading, math, science and behavior skills such as initial sounds, comprehension strategies, number sense, algebraic thinking, scientific process, and problem solving.
- It is important for the ESE teachers and tutors to have the right materials to support students with their learning deficits.
- Bridging gaps for students who are behind grade-level takes time beyond the ELA and Math blocks.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop faculty's knowledge of how to effectively identify student learning needs based on data from all assessments.
2. Use data to support students with decreasing learning deficits.
3. Leverage formal and informal assessments to measure the effectiveness of the supports being used by both the ESE teacher and tutors.
4. Monitor ESE teacher(s) and tutor schedules and lesson plans to ensure that support is being implemented with fidelity.
5. Engage with teachers during common planning to unpack standards, plan rigorous lessons, and discuss best practices and strategies for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Crystal Rodriguez (rodriguez2c@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student Safety, a sub category of Supportive Environment, was determined to be a critical need for improving according to our 5 Essentials Survey data. In response to, "Students feel safe both in and around the school building, and while they travel to and from home" 20% of our students reported they do not feel safe.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal for this category is to decrease from 20% to 12%- 15% or less of our students reporting that they do not feel safe both in and around the school building, and while they travel to and from school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lindsay DeWalt (dewaltl@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Child Safety Matters, a comprehensive, evidenced-based curriculum for elementary students that educates and empowers children and all relevant adults with information and strategies to prevent, recognize, and respond appropriately to safety awareness and a shared responsibility for safety.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to the Monique Burr Foundation, this program was developed with schools, not for schools, to make the best use of existing resources and ensure schools have effective programs that are easy to implement. It is presented in two comprehensive lessons ranging from 35-55 minutes (or in four shorter lessons) by trained facilitators in classrooms. Facilitators present turnkey scripts along with engaging, interactive Power Points including lecture, group discussion, skills-practice activities, videos, and games. This program will help students understand more about safety, their surroundings, and what to do in an unsafe environment. It also comes with worksheets that are shared with parents and families so they can also speak with students about the important safety topics and reiterate the importance at home.

Action Steps to Implement

School Counselor will facilitate the Child Safety Matters lessons and present to all students.

Person Responsible Lindsay DeWalt (dewaltl@duvalschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When analyzing Kings Trail’s data from the 2019-2020 Standards Walk-Through Dashboard, we noticed the area for assessing student learning was 2.3 out of 5.0, which demonstrates a need for improvement. Within that category, the following components require a focus: determines mastery, learning arc alignment and FSA alignment. The data is showing the tasks are aligned but student assessments may not be fully aligned to FSA and the assessments are not being given at the appropriate times based on the learning arc, which does not allow teachers to determine if students have mastered the standards. Therefore, teachers will receive more learning opportunities through PLCs and time to design aligned assessments within their common planning sessions.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers design standards-based assessments and assess student learning often at specific points within the learning arc, our goal for the assessing student learning category will increase from 2.3 to 3.5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sanethette Shubert (shuberts@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Standards-Based School Continuum will be used to guide the work towards the school designing and implementing standards-based assessments. This strategy allows for administrators and teachers to collaborate, calibrate, plan, develop and observe the alignment of the assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was developed to help teachers and administrators unify on becoming a standards-based school. Students are assessed often by both the district and state. This tool will support the school in aligning assessments, discovering our needs plans for next steps, planning, and reflection of assessments that are fully aligned to the standards, in addition to allowing time for observation to determine if the alignment is consistent.

Action Steps to Implement

- The learning arc planning document will be used when planning in both PLCs and common planning sessions. (weekly)
- Leverage common planning time for at minimum 50 minutes weekly to review assessments and modify and/or develop assessments that are aligned to grade-level standards.
- Conduct two classroom visits with the assistant principal and calibrate the findings.
- Visit 2-5 classrooms with instructional coaches weekly, calibrate, and determine school-wide professional development needs based on the findings of the classroom visits. Instructional coaches will plan and conduct professional development opportunities based on our findings.
- Prior to beginning a new unit or planning for a new concept, review assessments, and modify based on the standards. Allow time to create mini-assessments when developing the arc to ensure each part of the arc is being assessed along the way. Use the standards to guide the development of all assessments.
- Analyze student work using the Student Work Protocol bi-weekly. Use common language and grade-level standards to determine student mastery of the standards assessed. Teachers will bring students assessments to common planning sessions bi-weekly.
- Look for evidence within the classrooms of the use of standards-based assessments that were created during common planning.

Person Responsible Sanethette Shubert (shuberts@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

ELA learning gains is a school wide area of improvement that will be addressed in the following ways:

Evidence Based Strategies:

- Materials will be utilized to support students for ELA learning gains in the areas of tutoring, small group interventions, and push in support. These materials will include Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Performance Coach, Measuring Up, Conquering the Standards, BEEPS, CPALMS, Blended Learning, CommonLit, Newsela, Writing City, and Top Score Writing. These resources will be implemented with fidelity across K-5 grade levels.
- Push in support will work alongside teachers to help students improve specific reading skills based on data
- Tutoring for students in ELA.

Rationale for Evidence Based Strategy:

- Push In support will work with students to help them improve specific reading skills in the area of letter naming, initial sounds, phoneme segmentation and blending, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension strategies.
- Push in support will be provided with appropriate materials to support individual students' needs

Math learning gains is a school wide area of improvement that will be addressed in the following ways:

Evidence Based Strategies:

- Materials that will be utilized to support students for Math learning gains in the areas of tutoring, small group interventions, and push in support. These materials will include ACALETICS, FRECKLE Math, Performance Coach, Measuring Up, CPALMS, Blended Learning. These resources will be implemented with fidelity across K-5 grade levels.
- Push in support will work alongside teachers to help students improve specific math skills and math domains based on data
- Tutoring for students in Math.

Rationale for Evidence Based Strategy:

- Push In support will work with students to help them improve specific math skills in the areas of counting, comparing numbers, ordering numbers, place value, adding and subtracting whole numbers, multiplying and dividing whole numbers, adding and subtracting fractions, multiplying and dividing fractions, adding and subtracting decimals, multiplying and dividing decimals.
- Push in support will be provided with appropriate materials to support individual students' needs.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Kings Trail Elementary will create a school base Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support (PBIS) Team that will transform and positively impact our school's culture, environment, and learning. We will give priority to providing teachers and staff with opportunities to give input and participation in the schools decision- making process. Additionally, a priority focus will be for faculty and staff to be more visible and available to connect with and support students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Lowest Performing Quartile Gains (Math and ELA)				\$61,391.98
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2031 - Kings Trail Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$44,505.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Math Interventionist position</i>			
	5100	200-Employee Benefits	2031 - Kings Trail Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$16,886.98
			<i>Notes: Benefits for Math Interventionist position</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$411.48
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	620-Audio Visual Materials (Non-consumable)	2031 - Kings Trail Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$411.48
			<i>Notes: Listening Center Equipment, Portable CD Player (qty.1); Listening Center Headphones set of 8; 8-station junction box Volume (qty 2), Cd & cassette player with Bluetooth (qty 1)</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
					Total:	\$61,803.46