Northwestern Legends Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Northwestern Legends Elementary

2100 W 45TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/nle

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	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* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Northwestern Legends Elementary

2100 W 45TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/nle

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	99%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Northwestern Legends Elementary is to provide educational excellence in every classroom for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Northwestern Legends Elementary is to promote academic excellence and social responsibility.
Students will be fully engaged and will take ownership of their learning as they work on appropriately rigorous content that prepares them for success in college and in the workforce.

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
Polydore, Lawanda	Principal	The Principal will: Understand and lead the school systems and it's organization Understand and apply laws, rules, policies and procedures Understand and lead current educational trend and research Understand personnel evaluation protocol and other personnel procedures Apply skills to work cooperatively work with personnel at all levels of the organization Apply skills in personnel management and supervision techniques Plan, organize and manage multiple tasks and competing priorities Employ the continuous improvement process process for problem solving and managing change Analyze, interpret, and use data in decision-making Prepare and manage assigned budget and allocated resources Communicate effectively orally and in writing Supervise and support leadership development in others at all levels of the organization Counsel individuals relative to leadership opportunities and career options Build human capital Effectively maintain a positive culture and climate utilizing 5 Essentials data
Seals, Katreci	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will: Understand and lead the school systems and it's organization Understand and apply laws, rules, policies and procedures Understand and lead current educational trend and research Understand personnel evaluation protocol and other personnel procedures Apply skills to work cooperatively work with personnel at all levels of the organization Apply skills in personnel management and supervision techniques Plan, organize and manage multiple tasks and competing priorities Employ the continuous improvement process process for problem solving and managing change Analyze, interpret, and use data in decision-making Prepare and manage assigned budget and allocated resources Communicate effectively orally and in writing Supervise and support leadership development in others at all levels of the organization Counsel individuals relative to leadership opportunities and career options Build human capital Effectively maintain a positive culture and climate utilizing 5 Essentials data

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/29/2015, Kimberly Brown

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.*

2

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

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* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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	51	60	64	61	41	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	15	16	9	20	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	3	5	5	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/7/2020

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	19	56	76	59	49	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	37	26	21	18	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	12	8	7	8	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	33	50	44	44	45	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	257

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	35	36	36	24	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	19	56	76	59	49	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
Attendance below 90 percent	37	26	21	18	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	12	8	7	8	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	33	50	44	44	45	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	257

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	35	36	36	24	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	34%	50%	57%	17%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	58%	33%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	50%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	62%	63%	52%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	63%	62%	58%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	51%	58%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	25%	48%	53%	29%	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	30%	51%	-21%	58%	-28%
	2018	21%	50%	-29%	57%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	28%	52%	-24%	58%	-30%
	2018	22%	49%	-27%	56%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
	2018	18%	51%	-33%	55%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	2018	21%	59%	-38%	62%	-41%	
Same Grade Comparison		49%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	50%	64%	-14%	64%	-14%	
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		29%					
05	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%	
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	61%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	23%	49%	-26%	53%	-30%	
	2018	24%	56%	-32%	55%	-31%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
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	13	67	75	57	73	80					
BLK	34	63	63	62	71	67	24				
FRL	33	62	63	61	68	67	22				
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		18		10	29						
BLK	21	38	38	40	50	43	22				
FRL	21	38	38	41	51	43	23				
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	3	36	58	23	57	62					
BLK	16	33	57	51	58	58	30				
FRL	17	32	57	51	55	57	30				

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	54
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	61
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
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.

In 2012-2019, our school had 25% of the students proficient in science. The contributing factors are the lack of science labs effectively completed during the school day. Also, students began the year with a deficiency in science vocabulary and background skills in order to consistently make gains. Students continue to have a lack of interest in science curriculum which correlates with ELA data.

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

There were no declines this year.

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

NGSSS Science achievement- our school had 25% of the students proficient compared to the state at 53%.The contributing factor to this decline isthe lack of science labs effectively completed during the school day. Also, students began the year with a deficiency in science vocabulary and background. Students continue to have a lack of interest in science curriculum; however our science proficiency has increased.

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

According to the 2018-2019, ELA Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25% Percentile showed the most improvement. ELA learning Gains went from 38% in 2018 to 62% in 2019. Math Lowest 25% Percentile went from 43% in 2019 to 67% in 2019. The actions our school took this year was intentional focus on standards based instruction in both ELA and Math, differentiated ELA and Math support for every student, and planning every week with the end in mind. The use of supplemental curriculum such as Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading and ACALETICS all played a major part with student success.

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

Focused professional development for teachers and support from the Reading Coach, Common Planning- Unpacking the Standards, standards based instruction and focus on differentiated small groups using Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading and ACALETICS, tutoring, and consistent monitoring of student performance using student prescriptions, data chats and progress monitoring tools.

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

1. Science Achievement
2. ELA Achievement
3. Development of PLC
4. Implementation of DI interventions
5. Continuous Standards-Based Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading proficiency is a critical component of student success. All stakeholder's have identified reading is an area of focus for our school. During the 2019-2020 school year our school focused on standard-based instruction during Common planning. We will focus on standards-aligned instruction for 3rd-5th grade students in reading. The proficiency in reading was 34%. Duval County proficiency was 50% and the State of Florida was 57%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our SMART Goal for reading is to increase the 3rd-5th grade students' reading proficiency from 34% to 40% on 2020-2021 on PMA and I-ready Assessments. 90% of our Brick and Mortar classroom teachers will complete the Standards-based Student Work Protocol and the Learning Arc Framework during PLCs and Common Planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lawanda Polydore (polydorel@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Administration will guide teachers through the use of the Learning Arc Framework and use the student work protocol during our Monthly Common Planning and (PLC) meetings to focusing on reading standards as documented with charts, recordings and sign in..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Dufour 2018, " Intensive study of 24 schools (8 elementary, 8 middle, and 8 high schools) to reaffirm that schools operating as PLCs had a significant impact on both the classroom practice of teachers and student achievement". Teachers will be engaged in weekly PLC or Common Planning meetings that focus on standards-based learning groups that will analyze student work and performance using the student work protocol. Teachers will engage in a reflective practice process where they will participate in walk-through of each others rooms and provide feedback to each other on a monthly basis. All paraprofessionals, tutors and the reading interventionist will provide reading instruction using standards and/or DI materials. Students wills also connect Reading with social studies through real-world experiences via field trips such as the World of Nations International Festival. The Parent Liaison will work with parents training them on specific reading strategies to use at home, and also organize parent/student celebrations as students reach milestones in reading and science through monthly awards programs.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct 4 Standards Walk Monitoring for alignment.

Person Responsible	Lawanda Polydore (polydorel@duvalschools.org)

Common Planning to launch weekly Learning Arc and Student work protocal with each grade level

Person Responsible	Katreci Seals (johnsonk12@duvalschools.org)

Plan, Do, Check and Act. Discuss Learning Arc implementation and progress with standards alignment during District walks with Executive Director

Person Responsible	Deidra Johnson (johnsond2@duvalschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

None

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.

Saint Clair Evans Academy continue to use 5 Essentials strategies to involve parents and stakeholder's in all aspects of its Title I programs which includes economically disadvantaged, disabled, limited literacy, and African-American. The School Advisory Council participates in the development, implementation, and evaluation of
school level plans that include the School Improvement Plan and Parent Involvement Plan.
Over 50% of the SAC members are non-employees. All parents are given the opportunity to
review all plans and offer suggestions prior to approval. Our goal in to increase participation
by having all meetings on the same evening. Parent survey results are reviewed by SAC and
parent involvement members to determine necessary changes. All students will receive
Parent agendas. These agendas will be used to communicate with parents and maintain a
daily line of communication.

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
		Total:	**$0.00**