

Duval County Public Schools

Crystal Springs 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 | 23 |

Crystal Springs Elementary School

1200 HAMMOND BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32221

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

Demographics

Principal: Todd Simpson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 100% |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (42%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

* 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 | 23 |

Crystal Springs Elementary School

1200 HAMMOND BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32221

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 65% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | B | B | B | 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.

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire and prepare students for success in college or a career, and life.

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 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Simpson, Todd | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage Resources, which align to positive student outcomes - Develop high performing teachers, while implementing an effective Retention Plan - Develop High Performing Goals for Improvement - Implement instruction as the Learning Leader, as to improve tchr development, which impacts student achievement. |
| Bell, Melissa | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage Resources, which align to positive student outcomes - Develop high performing teachers, while implementing an effective Retention Plan - Develop High Performing Goals for Improvement - Implement instruction as the Learning Leader, as to improve tchr development, which impacts student achievement. |
| Bunker, Jill | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage Resources, which align to positive student outcomes - Develop high performing teachers, while implementing an effective Retention Plan - Develop High Performing Goals for Improvement - Implement instruction as the Learning Leader, as to improve tchr development, which impacts student achievement. |
| Tomlinson, Kimberly | Instructional Technology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducts i-Ready and Achieve 3000 testing for the entire school - Analyzes and Disaggregates Data for admin, grade levels and individual teachers, as to drive instructional decisions - Teaches informational technology to students on a rotating schedule, as to make them fully aware of the technology within our school building. In doing this, the teachers know how to integrate more technology effectively because of the students' skill set - She is the school's media liaison with the district, as she has developed and set-up a Facebook Page, Twitter Account, and she assists the school's Webmaster in updating and developing our school's website, so it can be used effectively. |
| Gray, Lesli | Teacher, ESE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversight of the entire school's ESE program - As the ESE Lead and Liaison, she runs all MRT meetings - Develops ESE small group plans for improvement with Regular Ed teachers - She analyzes and disaggregates data for the ESE Dept and develops plans for improvement |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/12/2020, Todd Simpson

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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) | 100% |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (42%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 | 132 | 173 | 150 | 199 | 179 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1011 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 26 | 23 | 25 | 21 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 36 | 100 | 85 | 98 | 34 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 409 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 64 | 116 | 90 | 120 | 30 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 464 |

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 | 41 | 91 | 78 | 87 | 30 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 370 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/12/2020

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 | 148 | 147 | 176 | 196 | 170 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1012 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 59 | 48 | 42 | 36 | 49 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 32 | 81 | 78 | 92 | 99 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 482 |

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 | 24 | 47 | 50 | 51 | 66 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305 |

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 | 32 | 66 | 69 | 257 | 38 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| Students retained two or more times | 53 | 82 | 115 | 137 | 199 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 785 |

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 | 148 | 147 | 176 | 196 | 170 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1012 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 59 | 48 | 42 | 36 | 49 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 32 | 81 | 78 | 92 | 99 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 482 |

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 | 24 | 47 | 50 | 51 | 66 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305 |

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 | 32 | 66 | 69 | 257 | 38 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| Students retained two or more times | 53 | 82 | 115 | 137 | 199 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 785 |

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 | 50% | 50% | 57% | 46% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 55% | 56% | 58% | 53% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 50% | 53% | 52% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 67% | 62% | 63% | 62% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 63% | 63% | 62% | 56% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | 52% | 51% | 42% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 53% | 48% | 53% | 52% | 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 | 53% | 51% | 2% | 58% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 50% | -2% | 57% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 41% | 52% | -11% | 58% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 49% | -2% | 56% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 46% | 50% | -4% | 56% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 51% | -5% | 55% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 74% | 61% | 13% | 62% | 12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 70% | 59% | 11% | 62% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 62% | 64% | -2% | 64% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 60% | -2% | 62% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 58% | 57% | 1% | 60% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 61% | -3% | 61% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 49% | 1% | 53% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 56% | 1% | 55% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 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 | 40 | 58 | 41 | 47 | 62 | 45 | 39 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 46 | 46 | 69 | 68 | | 60 | | | | |
| ASN | 64 | 59 | | 100 | 82 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 47 | 41 | 57 | 58 | 47 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 57 | 50 | 66 | 63 | 31 | 63 | | | | |
| MUL | 48 | 50 | | 68 | 77 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 63 | 57 | 73 | 63 | 25 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 57 | 50 | 64 | 61 | 36 | 53 | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 32 | 44 | 44 | 39 | 60 | 52 | 47 | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 47 | 50 | 69 | 74 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 85 | | 95 | 77 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 42 | 43 | 52 | 57 | 47 | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 51 | 50 | 58 | 60 | 60 | 56 | | | | |
| MUL | 52 | 68 | | 62 | 71 | | 70 | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 55 | 35 | 73 | 58 | 56 | 75 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 46 | 52 | 48 | 61 | 61 | 55 | 60 | | | | |
| 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 | 18 | 51 | 50 | 36 | 41 | 28 | 35 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 35 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 62 | 64 | | 81 | 36 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 44 | 50 | 56 | 50 | 45 | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 56 | 46 | 55 | 64 | 67 | 52 | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | 43 | | 60 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 58 | 62 | 68 | 60 | 34 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 53 | 54 | 59 | 55 | 37 | 48 | | | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 66 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 441 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 47 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

English Language Learners

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 54 |
| 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 | 71 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 47 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 61 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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.

For the past few years, we have struggled in the area of ELA in 3rd - 5th grade. The trend data indicates that this component of our overall data increases or decreases yearly by 1 - 3 percentage points - no consistency or sustainability of student performance or we simply flatline at 50 - 52% overall for all subgroup performance. One major contributing factor is that too many students are reading below grade level expectations, which negatively impacts them on a test in which all of the questions are written at or above grade level. Our children have difficulty simply decoding words - unable in many cases to utilize simple decoding strategies to attempt reading the words. Comprehension, Fluency, etc..., all of those major components of reading are not utilized during the reading process, hence flatlined or decreased scores at every grade level. Although we saw our students ability to decode and comprehend increase because of the implementation of RMSE, we feel like we have lost ground because of COVID-19, no school onsite since March 2020, and we were not able to implement virtually. We will most likely enter this year with low performing readers as a result of the last few months not being in school and the usual summer loss.

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

The greatest decline is the same as the greatest gap listed in section C - the Math LPQ's, focusing on all subgroups to make improvement, to increase student performance. A contributing factor for stagnant and low performance is iReady implementation. The blended learning platform is being underutilized by teachers and many are not effectively using, because they do not use the on time data to develop effective learning paths for all leveled learners. The county will be implementing a new blended learning platform in 4th and 5th grades, which self defines learning path according to data points. Also, all teachers will receive consistent training for implementation and students will become more engaged with a new platform, having used i-Ready for the previous 7 - 10 years. Although teachers have become more effective with analyzing and disaggregating data points, developing learning centers for all leveled learners is still an area in which we are continuing to grow.

Intentional and Strategic plans must be implemented at every grade level. 3rd grade improved the greatest on the FSA in '19. However, 4th and 5th either remained stagnant or went down, so we must understand the points needed to improve - moving buckets and/or the higher performing students must either increase proficiency levels or increase total number of scale score points within levels 3 and 4.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap or difference when analyzing our data focuses on the Math LPQ's. The Math LPQ's decreased the most, and our school's data lags behind both district and state data in this area. When developing FCIM plans this year, we must be more INTENTIONAL and STRATEGIC when moving this group of students, to outpace the district and the state. Our plans must be laser focused and the resources we utilize must be on point to not only capture needed points in this area, but to improve student performance within every subgroup, especially Caucasian, SWD's and Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged. 5th grade will be our point of reference, because this will be the only grade in which we will earn points for GROWTH, because of no data from this past school year. So,

the teachers must be intentional in focusing on those students and their points needed to move buckets, the next level and/or reach proficiency. Then, make the students aware during Data Chats and create learning paths for improvement through small group, blended learning and intervention groups.

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

The most improvement was minimal at best, as we improved 4 percentage points in the area of ELA Gains and Math Achievement. Improvement, yes, but far from reaching our goals, as there are still major gaps between the subgroups when we look at ALL subgroups within our student body. We do attribute the increase in these two areas to the following: strategic planning and implementation of an FCIM Calendar, Consistent Monitoring and an increased FOCUS on the LPQ's - not necessarily meeting proficiency, but improvement from last year. Now, we must continue with that strategic focus and effectively implement Acaletics, FRECKLE and small intensive groups that will be implemented after the mid-year data has posted. This is a part of our school's overall plan for improvement when making school wide growth at 3rd - 5th grades.

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

The two major areas of concern are the Math LPQ's - decreasing for most subgroups and this area has the greatest gap in terms of performance compared to the district and the state. The Caucasian subgroup, which leads in most categories of performance is the lowest of all subgroups in this area, even the ELLs and the SWDs outperformed this subgroup, The next area of concern is the ELA Achievement area - data has flatlined for the last few years, except a major push in the 3rd grade from the previous year. 3rd grade was the only grade level that increased in performance, when generally it flatlines versus 4th and 5th. The overall ELA Achievement is tied with the district, but lower than the state, and the Gains and LPQ Gains are lower than the district and the state. Baseline and Mid-Year testing from this year aligns to the previous year's FSA data, because it either flatlined or remained below that of the district and the state. The i-Ready and Achieve 3000 Levels of Performance were between Level 1 and Level 2 at the mid-year mark, because ALL were at the lower Level 1 mark at the beginning of the year. Yes, growth throughout the first few months of the school year, but minimal growth at BEST, because learners were growing at a steady rate, but a slower rate than needed to perform well on statewide testing because many were performing at a grade level or more below.

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

1. Math LPQ's - All Subgroups
2. ELA Achievement - All Subgroups
3. ELA Gains
4. ELA LPQ Gains
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Math LPQ's were selected because this was the area with the greatest difference between district and state data. All subgroups in this Area of Focus were below 50%, with Caucasians being the lowest of all subgroups, even lower than the SWD's and ELL's, which is very uncommon. This area/cell dropped 13% from the previous year, decreasing from 53% to 40% this past school year. Quick Glance data from the mid-year, Acaletics and Small Group Intervention indicated there would be an increase in student performance, but we did not take the FSA due to COVID-19. Therefore, it is still a FOCUS for this current year because 4th and 5th graders' data will impact overall school performance.

Measurable Outcome:

If we implement intentionally focused, strategic instructional plans based on current data points at each grade level, Utilize Acaletics in all 3 - 5 classrooms with fidelity, and Implement FRECKLE with fidelity in grades 4 and 5, then we will improve in this area from 40% to 50% on this year's FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Beyer (beyerb@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Acaletics, supplementary to CORE
 Praraprofessionals
 Tutors from local college (Approximately 2 - 3 a semester)

Math Coach
 Tutoring
 Math Supplemental Lesson Plans to implement Acaletics effectively
 Implement Math Technology Blended Learning Platforms and Software (iReady, Acaletics Supplementary Math Software to strengthen basic facts, test taking skills and stds aligned leveled questions, ets...) during center rotations

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We will use Title One funds to enhance and support this area for improvement. We will place paraprofessionals at each grade level to support small group instruction for students identified as LPQ's. The Math Coach will oversee the implementation of rigorous instruction during the CORE, and she will also oversee the implementation of FRECKLE and the continued use of Acaletics. We will also purchase and utilize math ancillary materials, in which to use during centers and small group intensive instruction.

She will also provide Common Planning for teachers, to develop their skill set to deliver quality, intentional instruction to ALL leveled learners, especially the LPQ's. Teachers will be given a survey, as to ascertain the PD needed for their development - Teacher Voice, and data will be utilized to determine PD needs, also. Tutoring will be offered for lower level learners, as determined by their current data points.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Acaletics, strategically placing students in leveled groups to receive instruction at least 30 minutes on a daily basis, with the most highest performing teacher teaching the largest groups.
2. Select Paraprofessionals will be working with students on a daily basis during Center Time, intensive, small group instruction.
3. The Math Coach will be overseeing all components of the Math Workshop, ensuring instruction is aligned to standards and teachers are implementing all phases with fidelity. She will provide classroom support and embed PD into Common Planning, to develop teacher skill set, which will improve student achievement. She will also develop her CP agenda with feedback from teachers, as to ensure it's strategic.
4. The Math Coach and Admin will monitor and provide support to teachers based on walkthroughs,

informals and annual evaluations. They will provide feedback to teachers, so teachers can utilize and implement the next steps for improvement.

Person Responsible Brittany Beyer (beyerb@duvalschools.org)

1. Implement an effective PD Plan within Common Planning sessions and Early Dismissal sessions to develop teacher skill set AND allow them time to collaborate, problem solve and develop effective centers.
2. Programs will be brought into the school that will enhance math instruction and reinforce standards taught by classroom teachers. This will not be limited to just math focused standards, but will include social standards of behavior that will increase a positive school environment, i.e. Harmony, CALM Classrooms, etc...
3. We will also hire a Parent Liaison using Title One dollars to build relationships and EMPOWER parents to effectively help their children in the home setting. Through this connection, she will also connect them to resources outside the school to support them, so they can support their child, i.e. Instructional Nights, Parent Conference Strategies, Provide Info for Resources in and outside the District, etc....

Person Responsible Brittany Beyer (beyerb@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We selected this area as an overall Area of Focus, because our data has declined or remained stagnant/flatlined the last few years, and the trend continues. This year, our overall achievement was tied with the district, but was lower than the state. The Gains and LPQ Gains were lower than the district and the state.

Measurable Outcome: If we implement intentionally focused, strategic instructional plans based on current data points, utilize RMSE in our primary classrooms, and implement the new writing curricula in KG - 5 (Writing City and Write Score), then achievement will improve in ELA Achievement from 50% to 60%, ELA Gains from 55% to 65% and ELA LPQ Gains from 45% to 55% on the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Bunker (bunkerj@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Reading Coach
- Reading Interventionist
- Para Pro's
- RMSE, LLI Kits (All Levels), Barton, etc...
- Tutoring (AM/PM)
- Media Specialist (50% from Title One)
- Grade Level technology platform software that's aligned to the level of Achieve 3000 and said grade level standards (aligned learning activities at all ALD levels).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Reading Coach will be utilized to design, monitor and assess quality instruction as to improve overall student achievement in all areas. She will also implement effective Common Planning sessions and PD sessions during Early Release. The Reading Interventionist will help with the implementation of RMSE in the primary grades, analyze and disaggregate data for students identified as Tier II and III students, then work with them in small, intensive groups utilizing LLI, Barton and other evidence-based supplementary materials. The Paras will also use these materials, at the oversight of the Interventionists during center time. Tutoring will be provided to BUBBLE students during the AM and or PM beginning in January. We will be paying the other half of our media specialist's salary to ensure he supports every classroom at Crystal Springs on a two-week rotation. He advances our overall literacy by implementing quality literacy lessons supporting every grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement effective and strategic center plans using current data points, Exit Tickets during CORE and/ or Teacher Observations according to the performance of ALL leveled learners. In these centers, teachers will be observed and supported using Job Embedded PD to develop teacher skill set.
2. Paraprofessionals and the Reading Interventionist will work with small, intensive groups using LLI, Barton, and/or RMSE, etc...
3. The Reading Coach will be overseeing all components of the Readers' Workshop, ensuring instruction is aligned to standards and teachers are implementing all components with fidelity. She will provide classroom support and embed PD into Common Planning and Early Dismissal to develop teacher skill set, which will improve student achievement.
4. After implementing quality instruction, monitor and provide support to teachers based on walkthroughs, informals and annual evaluations.

Person Responsible: Jill Bunker (bunkerj@duvalschools.org)

1. Implement an effective PD Plan within Common Planning sessions and Early Dismissal sessions to develop teacher skill set AND allow them time to collaborate, problem solve and develop effective centers to meet the needs of all leveled learners.
2. Utilize ancillary and technology software materials during centers and intensive small groups to meet the individual needs of students, to help them improve from level ALD levels 1 and 2 to at least a level 3 - lowest level of FSA performance.
3. Funds will be utilized to secure additional classroom teachers to support improving student achievement through class size amendment.

Person Responsible Jill Bunker (bunkerj@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the school's 5-Essentials data, we consistently ranked low in student safety. This area's trend data remains between 10 - 20% (very weak), as rated by our school's 5th graders. Therefore, we will focus on this area under Supportive Environment for overall school improvement.

Measurable Outcome: At least 50% or more of our 5th graders will score safety at the strong level or higher, after having implemented action steps for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Bunker (bunkerj@duvalschools.org)

Calm Classrooms

Evidence-based Strategy: Character Education
Child Safety Matters

Harmony

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies will be implemented school wide as to develop a safe and supportive environment at every grade level, in every classroom. The students will learn to monitor their own behavior and how they respond to different incidents. These strategies will provide them tools to take care of their emotional and mental health, which will positively impact the entire school community.

Action Steps to Implement

- Develop our counseling program to include more individual and group counseling for students with ongoing behavior issues.
- Implement and Review the Guidelines of Success and the Behavior Expectations for areas outside the classroom, i.e. bathrooms, playground and in the cafeteria.
- Students will learn bathroom, hallways, cafeteria, and playground protocols for proper behavior
- Cultivate a caring and positive environment through positive reinforcement strategies
- Implement Calm Classroom on a daily basis in every classroom
- Tchr implements relationship building activities to develop bonds with students so they can become more trustworthy.

Person Responsible Jill Bunker (bunkerj@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After reviewing this year's data from the Dashboard, our teachers were rated at a 4.1 out of 5 in the area of Instructional Delivery. Instruction and Tasks inconsistently aligned to the posted standard on the Focus Board. The learning activities did not meet the demands of said standard, which put students at a disadvantage for completing learning activities at higher ALD levels.

Measurable Outcome: To have at least 90% or more of our teachers aligning instruction and the learning activities/tasks to standards to ensure students are receiving quality, rigorous instruction and learning activities that are comparable to what they will see on the state assessment in the Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Todd Simpson (simpson@duvalschools.org)

Implementing quality instruction that meets the standard posted on the Focus Board.

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool to ensure there is an alignment between implemented standard, instruction and learning activities.

Use the Student Work Protocol to ensure activities are aligned to standard

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order for the students to meet the academic demands of the annual FSA testing, they must be provided instruction which is aligned to the posted standard and all learning activities must be at an ALD level of 3 or higher on a consistent basis, which will allow students to be very familiar with the level of rigor and the demands of said standard.

Action Steps to Implement

- Continue Unpacking standards, educating and empowering teachers to teach the depth of the standard and ensure that quality, rigorous instruction is being implemented and the learning activities are aligned at standard and are rigorous.
- Use the Student Work Protocol to assess the rigor of learning activities to ensure they are aligned and meets the level of rigor of said standard
- Administration and Instructional Coaches will conduct focused walks/walkthroughs to view instruction and assess according to the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool, provide feedback and support and then monitor for improvement and teacher development.
- Common Planning sessions will focus on improvement based upon walkthroughs and current data points of focus to improve at every grade level. Continuously work on learning arcs and standards based instruction as an area for overall improvement and provide teachers learning experiences to give them voice and choice (teacher influence - 5Essentials Survey data).

Person Responsible Todd Simpson (simpson@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

We continually build a positive environment by providing an open an inviting school environment to all our stakeholders through nightly learning activities, participation in PTA, SAC, Volunteerism throughout the school and monthly planned activities through our Parent Resource Room. We provide monthly activities to educate and empower our parents, which include resource offerings, nightly activities and activities provided by the district to support our parents in the home setting, which are held in the AM and PM. We also conduct activities off campus to build community by working with our faith based partners, especially RISE Church. We conduct at least two events each year off site, as to build community with our students from all of our neighborhoods. We also conduct a winter carnival in which we not only connect with our school community, but we invite all our business partners and faith based partners to be a part of the event. These activities allow us to build COMMUNITY between school, neighborhood business partners and faith based partnerships.

This year, we will be implementing Calm Classrooms at every grade level, and we will be strengthening our monthly Character Education program, also. This will continually build a positive environment within the building, as our students will not only recognize their behavior, but thy will be empowered to make better choices. which will positively impact student behavior and interactions in and outside of CSE.

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: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 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: | | | \$0.00 |