

Duval County Public Schools

Gregory Drive 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 | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Gregory Drive Elementary School

7800 GREGORY DR, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

Demographics

Principal: Augena Sapp

Start Date for this Principal: 11/4/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (35%) |
| 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 | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Gregory Drive Elementary School

7800 GREGORY DR, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

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 KG-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 | 86% |

School Grades History

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

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.

Gregory Drive Elementary School is a school in which every child, regardless of his or her background, becomes a healthy, productive, and educated member of society, through a safe and supportive academic experience.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will become a successful reader by integrating math, science, and technology across all academic areas to reach his or her highest potential, drawing on the child's entire community for support.

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 |
|------------------|------------------------|---|
| Sapp, Augena | Principal | AuGena Sapp, Principal - Will monitor standards taught and planned for core curriculum. Monitor and model the use of Gradual Release Model, and scaffolded instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Student data will be monitored and analyzed through data chats and monitored during monthly RTI meetings. Instruction will be monitored through classroom observations(Perform) and frequent forms of feedback. Professional development will be determined based on all of the above. As needed, the principal will initiate growth plans for intensive professional development and monitor task completion. |
| Washington, Teri | Instructional Coach | Teri Washington, Math Coach - Provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and implementation of rigorous math instruction as it pertains to Common Core standards/ New Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and requested and assists teachers with lesson planning. She also supports teachers by conducting intervention on a small group of students. |
| Brown, Tangela | School Counselor | Tangela Brown, School Counselor- Facilitates MRT meetings, Problem Solving/RTI meetings, 504 meetings. Serves as the school's liaison between the school and the district as it pertains to MRT (Multi-Referral Team) meetings on a monthly basis. Supports the needs of the whole child and provides resources to parents. |
| Clawson, Tamme | Administrative Support | Tamme Clawson - Reading Interventionist - Provides instructional support and intervention for students in the area of ELA. Analyzes data and plans next steps for instruction to move students towards being on grade level. |
| Mincey, Mornike | Assistant Principal | Mornike Mincey, Assistant Principal - Will monitor standards taught and planned for core curriculum. Monitor and model the use of Gradual Release Model, and scaffolded instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Student data will be monitored and analyzed through data chats and monitored during monthly RTI meetings. Instruction will be monitored through classroom observations(Perform) and frequent forms of feedback. Professional development will be determined based on all of the above. |
| James, Truella | Instructional Coach | Truella James, ELA Coach - Provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and implementation of rigorous ELA instruction as it pertains to Common Core standards/ New Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and requested |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------|------------------------|--|
| | | and assists teachers with lesson planning. She also supports teachers by conducting intervention on a small group of students. |
| Torian, Nikki | Administrative Support | Instructional Data Analyst. Monitors, analyzes, and reports all instructional and Early Warning System data. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 11/4/2017, Augena Sapp

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |

| | |
|--|--|
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (35%) |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 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 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

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 | 0 | 99 | 112 | 91 | 99 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 505 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 38 | 46 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |

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 | 35 | 67 | 55 | 71 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 |

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 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 | 0 | 99 | 112 | 91 | 99 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 505 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 38 | 46 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |

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 | 35 | 67 | 55 | 71 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 |

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 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 | 30% | 50% | 57% | 23% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 49% | 56% | 58% | 44% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | 50% | 53% | 62% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 39% | 62% | 63% | 29% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | 63% | 62% | 41% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | 52% | 51% | 34% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 21% | 48% | 53% | 28% | 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 | 24% | 51% | -27% | 58% | -34% |
| | 2018 | 30% | 50% | -20% | 57% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 29% | 52% | -23% | 58% | -29% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 23% | 49% | -26% | 56% | -33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 50% | -20% | 56% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 51% | -14% | 55% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 31% | 61% | -30% | 62% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 59% | -17% | 62% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 47% | 64% | -17% | 64% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 60% | -37% | 62% | -39% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 24% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 33% | 57% | -24% | 60% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 61% | -27% | 61% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 20% | 49% | -29% | 53% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 56% | -20% | 55% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| 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 | 18 | 17 | | 11 | 38 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 14 | 73 | | 21 | 82 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 43 | 39 | 37 | 58 | 60 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 20 | 71 | 80 | 40 | 84 | | 20 | | | | |
| MUL | 58 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | 48 | | 35 | 48 | | 15 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 27 | 45 | 52 | 36 | 57 | 63 | 16 | | | | |
| 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 | 23 | 21 | | 36 | 23 | | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 11 | 21 | | 22 | 29 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 40 | 33 | 29 | 38 | 33 | 28 | | | | |
| HSP | 30 | 27 | | 41 | 43 | | 20 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 63 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | 54 | | 35 | 48 | | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 42 | 33 | 34 | 41 | 33 | 35 | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 57 | | 36 | 46 | | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 5 | 40 | | 19 | 45 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 46 | 73 | | 54 | 36 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 45 | 62 | 26 | 42 | 32 | 28 | | | | |
| HSP | 12 | 35 | | 29 | 48 | | 30 | | | | |
| MUL | 15 | | | 31 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | 39 | | 34 | 41 | | 33 | | | | |
| FRL | 23 | 43 | 57 | 26 | 41 | 38 | 23 | | | | |

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 | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 377 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 17 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 50 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 41 |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 36 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| 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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

1. NA
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>ELA Standards-aligned Instruction: Standards Focus Walk data shows Gregory Drive averaging a 1.9 Sum of Averages for assessing student work. The areas were Determining Mastery, Learning Arc Alignment, and FSA Alignment. The 5 Essentials Data says that schools with strong Quality Professional Development, teacher development is rigorous and focused on student learning.</p> <p>Based on a comparison to the benchmark, an mScore of 57 means that Gregory Drive Elementary School is neutral on this measure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correcting the gap in literacy is the objective in order to increase proficiency in reading. Using researched based programs, we hope to correct the foundational deficiencies and build fluency for improved comprehension. 2. Monitoring instructional delivery and standards based alignment with feedback will provide teachers with immediate strategies for implementation in order to improve student academic achievement. 3. Research indicates that fully teaching the standards will produce higher proficiency. |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>Standards Focus Walk data will improve from a 1.9 Sum of Averages for assessing student work to at least 3.5.</p> <p>5 Essentials Data, under strong professional development will increase from 57 (neutral) to 75 (strong).</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards Walk-through observations to monitor the instructional delivery of the standards and objectives will build capacity within the teachers. 2. Common planning structured to unpack the standards 3. Administration will calibrate, collaborate, plan, and align observations to improve classroom standards based instruction. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned instruction so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards. |

Action Steps to Implement

~Frequent walk-through observations with feedback from administration and instructional support staff.

Person Responsible Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

~Teachers will engage in weekly Common Planning to unpack, plan, and pull resources focused on standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Truella James (jamest3@duvalschools.org)

~ Provide Professional Learning Cycles to plan standards based units of study using authentic literature and analyzing student work and assessments for alignment.

Person Responsible Truella James (jamest3@duvalschools.org)

~ Monitor remediation with the Bottom Quartile students using Leveled Literacy Instruction, Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery Signature Edition, Language for Learning, and Benchmark Assessments.

Person Responsible Nikki Torian (hudsonn1@duvalschools.org)

~Engagement in real world experiences to build student background knowledge by planning field trip to support standards.

Person Responsible Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

~ Title 1: Utilize Instructional Support staff and paraprofessionals to conduct small group instruction.

Person Responsible Tamme Clawson (clawsont@duvalschools.org)

~ Title 1: Provide Media Specialist with standards to align with Core instruction for student visits.

Person Responsible Truella James (jamest3@duvalschools.org)

~ Title 1: Provide the students with more texts in hand for increased exposure to literature.

Person Responsible Tamme Clawson (clawsont@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Science Standards-aligned Instruction:

Standards Focus Walk data shows Gregory Drive averaging a 1.9 Sum of Averages for assessing student work. The areas were Determining Mastery, Learning Arc Alignment, and FSA Alignment. The 5 Essentials Data says that schools with strong Quality Professional Development, teacher development is rigorous and focused on student learning.

Based on a comparison to the benchmark, an mScore of 57 means that Gregory Drive Elementary School is neutral on this measure.

1. Merging literature science standards will improve instruction and increase proficiency in science. Using researched based programs, we hope to correct the foundational deficiencies and build vocabulary and conceptualization for improved performance.
2. Monitoring instructional delivery and standards based alignment with feedback will provide teachers with immediate strategies for implementation in order to improve student academic achievement.
3. Research indicates that fully teaching the standards will produce higher proficiency.

Students will be targeted for proficiency and their data will be monitored to solidify 65% or higher on each re-assessment by providing remediation for the standards that do not meet mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

Standards Focus Walk data will improve from a 1.9 Sum of Averages for assessing student work to at least 3.5.

5 Essentials Data, under strong professional development will increase from 57 (neutral) to 75 (strong).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Standards Walk-through observations to monitor the instructional delivery of the standards and objectives will build capacity within the teachers.
2. Common planning structured to unpack the standards
3. Administration will calibrate, collaborate, plan, and align observations to improve classroom standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned instruction so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

~Engagement in real world experiences to build student background knowledge by planning field trips to support standards.

Person Responsible

Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

~Frequent walk-through observations with feedback from administration and instructional support staff.

Person Responsible

Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

~Monitoring fidelity of use for Acaletics Science

Person Responsible Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

~ Increased remediation of standards by analyzing assessment data monthly

Person Responsible Nikki Torian (hudsonn1@duvalschools.org)

~Providing students with monthly benchmark assessments in order to monitor mastery of standards taught

Person Responsible Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

~ Provide the students with more literature integration in Science.

Person Responsible Truella James (jamest3@duvalschools.org)

~ Provide teachers with Science Professional Learning Cycles once per month to plan standards based units of study using exploration and literature with a focus on analyzing student work for alignment.

Person Responsible Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Mathematics Standards-aligned Instruction:

Standards Focus Walk data shows Gregory Drive averaging a 1.9 Sum of Averages for assessing student work. The areas were Determining Mastery, Learning Arc Alignment, and FSA Alignment. The 5 Essentials Data says that schools with strong Quality Professional Development, teacher development is rigorous and focused on student learning.

Based on a comparison to the benchmark, an mScore of 57 means that Gregory Drive Elementary School is neutral on this measure.

1. Increased focus on the learning arc to unpack standards will improve instruction and increase proficiency in mathematics. Using researched based programs, we hope to correct the foundational deficiencies and build fluency and conceptualization for improved performance.
2. Monitoring instructional delivery and standards based alignment with feedback will provide teachers with immediate strategies for implementation in order to improve student academic achievement.
3. Research indicates that fully teaching the standards will produce higher proficiency.

Students will be targeted for proficiency and their data will be monitored to solidify 65% or higher on each re-assessment by providing remediation for the standards that do not meet mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

Standards Focus Walk data will improve from a 1.9 Sum of Averages for assessing student work to at least 3.5.

5 Essentials Data, under strong professional development will increase from 57 (neutral) to 75 (strong).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Standards Walk-through observations to monitor the instructional delivery of the standards and objectives will build capacity within the teachers.
2. Common planning structured to unpack the standards
3. Administration will calibrate, collaborate, plan, and align observations to improve classroom standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned instruction so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

~Provide teachers weekly common planning sessions to plan by unpacking the standards and aligning resources, manipulatives, and strategies for math to build effective lessons.

Person Responsible

Teri Washington (washingtot4@duvalschools.org)

~ Provide teachers with Math Professional Learning Cycles to analyzing student work and assessments.

Person Responsible

Teri Washington (washingtot4@duvalschools.org)

~ Provide the students with more fact fluency practice.

Person Responsible Teri Washington (washingtot4@duvalschools.org)

~Providing students with frequent assessments in order to monitor mastery of standards taught.

Person Responsible Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

~ Increased remediation of standards by analyzing assessment data monthly

Person Responsible Nikki Torian (hudsonn1@duvalschools.org)

~Engagement in real world experiences to build student background knowledge by planning field trips to support standards.

Person Responsible Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

~Monitoring fidelity of use for Acaletics Math

Person Responsible Teri Washington (washingtot4@duvalschools.org)

~Frequent walk-through observations with feedback from administration and instructional support staff.

Person Responsible Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

~Increase remediation of standards by analyzing assessment data monthly and utilizing instructional support staff and paraprofessional to conduct small group.

Person Responsible Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

~Provide differentiated small group materials through the utilization of MAFS iReady workbooks for standard based rigorous practice.

Person Responsible Teri Washington (washingtot4@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 5 Essentials data show that there needs to be a focus on the area of positive culture and environment for teachers, students, and parents in 3 areas. Student-Teacher Trust - 43 (neutral), Parent-Teacher Trust - 12 (Very Weak), and Teacher-Teacher Trust - 29 (Weak). Improving this area will have a positive impact on the social, emotional, and academic success of students. It will also improve the teacher retention, cultural proficiency, and relationship between colleagues, administration, parents, and students. Using a book study of Cultural Proficiency: A Manual for School Leaders has benefited many school leaders, students, teachers and communities they serve. Cultural Proficiency helps to establish a mindset and worldview for effectively describing and responding to inequities.

On the 5 Essentials survey, students responded and Student-Teacher Trust received a performance of 43 (neutral). The goal is to improve this performance to increase at least 15 points.

Measurable Outcome:

On the 5 Essentials survey, parents responded and Parent-Teacher Trust received a performance of 12 (Very Weak). The goal is to improve this performance to increase at least 30 points.

On the 5 Essentials survey, teachers responded and Teacher-Teacher Trust received a performance of 29 (Weak). The goal is to improve this performance to increase at least 15 points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Monthly staff assessments will be administered using the Cultural Proficiency Continuum to track improvement from the assessment given at the beginning of the year. Admin created surveys will be given to students, parents, faculty and staff to keep a current pulse on positive school culture and environment and action steps will result from the analyzing of the data. Official end of year 5 Essentials data will be used as the specific measure that will prove our success with these intentional efforts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

5 Essentials Survey (Implementing next steps for each area) is a tool that is used to plan for school improvement. Healthy data on this survey has a direct impact on the academic success of a school

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly staff assessments will be administered using the Cultural Proficiency Continuum to track improvement from the assessment given at the beginning of the year.

Person Responsible

Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

Admin created surveys will be given to students, parents, faculty and staff to keep a current pulse on positive school culture and environment and action steps will result from the analyzing of the data.

Person Responsible

Morenike Mincey (minceym@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To be continued..

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.

The 5 Essentials data show that there needs to be a focus on the area of positive culture and environment for teachers, students, and parents. This intentional improvement will be implemented this year in the following ways:

Teachers: Teachers will be engaged in a book study using Cultural Proficiency: 4th edition by Randall B. Lindsey. This book will engage colleagues in collaborative dialogue about creating powerful teaching and learning environments. It will help teachers recognize and respond to both individual and group differences to break down barriers. Following each Early Release day, teachers will use the Cultural Proficiency Continuum to assess the limitations of school practices and identify opportunities to shift the culture.

Students: Students will benefit from the book study of their teachers. In addition, students will be engaged in frequent surveys and positive experiences that build awareness and respect for the relationship of others. The input from students will guide administration with next steps to ensure that the students feel valued and are respected which will improve the positive school culture.

Parents: Parents will be surveyed more frequently to provide the school with feedback and suggestions that would improve school culture. Monthly parent nights will maximize opportunity for teachers and parents to engage in positive interaction to positively impact the social, emotional, and academic success of each child.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|---|--------|

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |