# Bartram Springs Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Bartram Springs Elementary

### 14799 BARTRAM SPRINGS PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32258

### http://www.duvalschools.org/bartramsprings

## Demographics

## Principal: Kimberley Wright

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 40% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (70%)<br><br>2017-18: A (71%)<br><br>2016-17: A (75%)<br><br>2015-16: A (72%) |
| **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

# Bartram Springs Elementary

14799 BARTRAM SPRINGS PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32258

[http://www.duvalschools.org/bartramsprings](http://www.duvalschools.org/bartramsprings)

## 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 | No | 24% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 54% |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.](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.**

Bartram Springs Eagles, families, and community working together will SOAR to attain educational excellence by:
providing a Safe, Inclusive, and Nurturing Environment,
providing Opportunities for academic, social, and emotional growth,
providing Academic success through focused, data driven instruction and
by continuously Reviewing student progress, to match instruction to meet the needs of an ever evolving community of learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Engage students in data-driven instruction that inspires them to take ownership of learning and excel academically while promoting leadership and collaboration that supports and encourages life-long learning.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Wright, Kimberley | Principal | Oversee the School Leadership Team. The principal will share student data and lead the team in data analysis as well as problem solving. The team will work together to develop goals and strategies to improve student achievement. The team consists of representation from each grade level. |
| Bartley, Cynthia | Assistant Principal | |
| Bradley, Stacy | Assistant Principal | |
| Dortch, Tatiana | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Walsh, Colleen | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Weaks, Caroline | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Virgil, Jaclyn | Teacher, ESE | |
| Ray , Cindy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Pitts, Ingrid | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Clements, Vicki | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Spears, Racheal | Teacher, K-12 | |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Kimberley Wright

**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**
51

**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** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 40% |
| **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: A (70%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (72%) |
| **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 | 204 | 196 | 175 | 149 | 157 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1023 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 35 | 71 | 43 | 35 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 66 | 101 | 61 | 55 | 11 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 323 |

**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 | 30 | 66 | 36 | 29 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/17/2020

## 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 | 188 | 195 | 156 | 145 | 149 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 968 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 18 | 48 | 32 | 54 | 49 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 |

**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 | 15 | 17 | 19 | 10 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |

**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 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

**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 | 188 | 195 | 156 | 145 | 149 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 968 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 18 | 48 | 32 | 54 | 49 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 |

**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 | 15 | 17 | 19 | 10 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |

**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 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

## 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 | 78% | 50% | 57% | 77% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 73% | 56% | 58% | 72% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 57% | 50% | 53% | 56% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 81% | 62% | 63% | 87% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 73% | 63% | 62% | 80% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | 52% | 51% | 74% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 75% | 48% | 53% | 79% | 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 | 76% | 51% | 25% | 58% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 50% | 25% | 57% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 78% | 52% | 26% | 58% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 49% | 24% | 56% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 73% | 50% | 23% | 56% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 51% | 24% | 55% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 83% | 61% | 22% | 62% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 80% | 59% | 21% | 62% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 70% | 64% | 6% | 64% | 6% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 60% | 21% | 62% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 83% | 57% | 26% | 60% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 61% | 22% | 61% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 74% | 49% | 25% | 53% | 21% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 77% | 56% | 21% | 55% | 22% |
| 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 | 60 | 66 | 56 | 62 | 63 | 52 | 45 | | | | |
| ELL | 71 | 71 | | 75 | 61 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 79 | | 93 | 72 | | 88 | | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 61 | 37 | 71 | 67 | 50 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 81 | 72 | | 87 | 69 | | 73 | | | | |
| MUL | 76 | 70 | | 79 | 81 | | 73 | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 78 | 70 | 83 | 75 | 59 | 85 | | | | |
| FRL | 71 | 70 | 48 | 78 | 76 | 56 | 73 | | | | |

### 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 | 48 | 47 | 24 | 57 | 57 | 44 | 45 | | | | |
| ELL | 64 | 75 | 70 | 77 | 75 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 87 | 80 | | 91 | 83 | | 88 | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | 56 | 38 | 72 | 58 | 38 | 59 | | | | |
| HSP | 82 | 81 | | 87 | 70 | | 95 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 67 | | 83 | 71 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 66 | 47 | 87 | 80 | 80 | 81 | | | | |
| FRL | 72 | 68 | 57 | 81 | 73 | 60 | 74 | | | | |

### 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 | 49 | 36 | 29 | 51 | 50 | 47 | 62 | | | | |
| ELL | 71 | 80 | | 76 | 100 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | 75 | | 98 | 88 | | 100 | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | 63 | 39 | 79 | 73 | 67 | 67 | | | | |
| HSP | 86 | 79 | | 92 | 88 | 93 | 83 | | | | |
| MUL | 72 | 71 | | 87 | 80 | | 70 | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 71 | 58 | 86 | 79 | 71 | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 72 | 71 | 67 | 84 | 79 | 76 | 71 | | | | |

## 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 | 70 |
| 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 | 71 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 562 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 58 |
| 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 | 70 |
| 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 | 84 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 76 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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.**

The lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance in Math. Based on our FSA data from 2018 to 2019, our students demonstrated a decrease by 12%. Many of the students in the lowest quartile are ESE and did not demonstrate a year's growth.

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

The lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline. Many students within this group lack the required foundational skills resulting in academic gaps. The lack of differentiated instruction, targeting foundational skills to bridge those gaps and meeting the needs of individual students contributed to this factor.

**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.**

We exceeded the state average in 5 out of the 7 accountability components. There was a significant difference in Science Achievement. The State average was 53%, our average was 75%. There was also a significant difference in ELA Achievement. The State average was 57%, our average was 78%.

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

Our learning gains in ELA demonstrated the most improvement. Our gains increased from 67% to 73%. After analysis of student data, our teachers used Tier 2 resources such as the Ready LAFS Teacher Toolkit, Phonics for Reading and REWARDS to remediate skills with students.

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

Based on our EWS data, one area of concern is the number of students scoring at a Level 1 on the statewide assessment. Another area of concern is attendance below 90 percent.

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

1. Increase Math Proficiency and Math Learning Gains.
2. Increase Science Proficiency.
3. Increase academic achievement in the following subgroups: SWD, ELL and African-American students.
4. Decrease the number of lower level confrontations from the 2018-19 school year.
5. To improve our scores on the 5 Essentials Survey in the areas of Effective Leaders and Collaborative Teachers.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on our 2019 FSA data, our students demonstrated a decrease in Math proficiency as well as learning gains. Our proficiency rate decreased from 85% to 81%. Our overall math learning gains decreased from 74% to 73%. Our math learning gains for our lowest 25% decreased from 66% to 54%. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | If teachers provide targeted, data-driven instruction along with the appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, we will increase proficiency in Math from 81% to 83% as well as increasing learning gains for our lowest 25% from 54% to 58%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will use resources such as Duval Math, Ready MAFS, the Ready Teacher Toolkit, Measuring Up, Freckle and any additional evidence-based materials to remediate foundational skills to increase student achievement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students with gaps in their math foundational skills are less likely to demonstrate one year's growth as measured on the FSA Math Assessment. These students need targeted intervention taught through small group instruction or one-on-one instruction to remediate their skills. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

1. Teachers will analyze 2018-19 FSA data, 2019-20 progress monitoring data (iReady, PMAs) and 2020-21 baseline data to identify students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.
2. Teachers will group students based on their instructional needs.
3. Teachers will remediate foundational skills through small-group instruction before, during and/or after school.
4. Freckle by Renaissance Learning will be used by students in 4th and 5th grade.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on the total number of SWT observations conducted last year, our rating averaged 2.2 out of 5 in the area of Assessing Student Learning. Our data shows that teachers need to improve in the areas of determining mastery of standards, alignment to the Learning Arc and alignment to the FSA. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 100% of our core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based planning procedures with a focus on student tasks and assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks and assessments. Evidence will include student work samples and teacher assessments. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, all students need to have greater access to grade-appropriate assignments. All students, especially those who are behind grade level, need access to instruction that asks them to think and engage deeply with challenging material. |

### Action Steps to Implement

During PLCs, the Admin Team will provide monthly training to teachers on how to use the Learning Arc to determine alignment to the standard.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

The Admin Team will continue to conduct weekly observations using the Standards Walk-through Tool.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

During PLCs, the Admin Team will work with teachers to review, revise and/or create assessments that are aligned to the standard.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

During PLCs, Admin Team will use the EQUIP Student Work Protocol with teachers to analyze student work.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in Instructional Rounds to observe effective standards-based instruction.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**As an additional school-wide improvement priority, we will focus on increasing our scores on the 5 Essentials Survey in the areas of Effective Leaders and Collaborative Teachers. On the 2020 survey, we were rated as Neutral in the area of Effective Leaders. We were rated as Weak in the area of Collaborative Teachers. Our goal for 2020-21, is to improve to Strong in the area of Effective Leaders and Neutral or Strong in the area of Collaborative Teachers.**

**We will implement the following action steps:**
**- Create more time in the schedule for teacher collaboration.**
**- Identify teacher leaders that can lead professional development with peers.**
**- Empower the School Leadership Team to plan professional development for the staff as well as monitoring student achievement.**
**- Provide more opportunities for teachers to participate in Instructional Rounds providing each other with feedback.**

## 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.

Our school provides a positive school culture by implementing a coherent shared vision among all stake holders. This vision allows for all stakeholders to feel that their concerns and opinions are being heard and that they are being treated fairly. The administrative team operates within the concept of an open-door policy, wherein faculty and staff are encouraged to share ideas and/or initiatives freely. Surveys such as the 5Essentials, provide feedback that helps the administration to target areas of need related to the climate and culture. The establishment of teams such as Leadership, Shared Decision Making and PBIS ensures the voice of school-based stakeholders is considered as it relates to instructional needs and/or practices, the daily routines, and school-wide behavior concerns.

The School Advisory Committee helps to ensure the voices of stakeholders outside of the school setting are heard. This committee consists of individuals from various backgrounds who play a vital role in decision-making conversations related to school improvement.

CHAMPS, a school-wide behavior plan is implemented in all classrooms, as well as common areas within our school. Generating school and classroom expectations, including having leadership that will follow through consistently with consequences, creates a sense of trust and support from all stake holders. Being able to align our classroom discipline processes, procedures and consequences with the Student Code of Conduct allows for all stakeholders to be involved which has the greatest effect on positive school culture.

Recognition is one way students feel valued. Focusing on a character trait each month provides students the ability to be recognized by their teacher in front of other students, staff, and parents. The power of praise promotes an awareness that changes student behaviors and allows for others to see how this character trait aligns with our school expectations.

Building authentic relationships between staff and all stakeholders with a focus on supporting all students will directly impact our school's success.

### 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: Standards-aligned Instruction | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |