Jacksonville Heights Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jacksonville Heights Elementary School

7750 TEMPEST ST S, Jacksonville, FL 32244

http://www.duvalschools.org/jhe

Demographics

Principal: Candice Glover V

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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 (41%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	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

Jacksonville Heights Elementary School

7750 TEMPEST ST S, Jacksonville, FL 32244

http://www.duvalschools.org/jhe

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	83%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of Jacksonville Heights Elementary to establish a safe and nurturing learning environment that promotes high level, quality instruction and services that meet the needs of the whole child in every classroom, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Jacksonville Heights Elementary is to provide excellence for every student so that they have the skills necessary to become lifelong learners and productive citizens of the 21st century.

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
Williams Scott, Andrea	Principal	
Palmer, Lashanda	Assistant Principal	
Greene, Jeremy	Other	Reading Interventionist
Walker, Yolanda	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Candice Glover V

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.*
3

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
32

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 (41%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	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	88	101	81	98	99	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	41	45	31	34	30	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233
One or more suspensions	6	6	3	13	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	2	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	50	67	61	62	40	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	63	80	62	74	43	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370

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	53	74	61	65	48	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	354

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	4	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	103	117	100	139	138	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	719
Attendance below 90 percent	49	47	38	42	40	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	2	6	4	10	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	45	83	69	111	105	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509

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	31	61	59	91	79	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396

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	22	67	35	244	47	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Students retained two or more times	32	43	85	105	147	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559

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	103	117	100	139	138	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	719
Attendance below 90 percent	49	47	38	42	40	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	2	6	4	10	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	45	83	69	111	105	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509

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	31	61	59	91	79	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396

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	22	67	35	244	47	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Students retained two or more times	32	43	85	105	147	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559

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%	35%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	56%	58%	49%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	53%	51%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	38%	62%	63%	37%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	63%	62%	45%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	43%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	48%	53%	46%	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	26%	51%	-25%	58%	-32%	
	2018	26%	50%	-24%	57%	-31%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	29%	52%	-23%	58%	-29%	
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	56%	-24%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					
05	2019	30%	50%	-20%	56%	-26%	
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	24%	61%	-37%	62%	-38%	
	2018	37%	59%	-22%	62%	-25%	
Same Grade Comparison		-13%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	37%	64%	-27%	64%	-27%	
	2018	47%	60%	-13%	62%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		-10%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%	
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	61%	-14%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison	-22%					
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	14	43	39	22	42	36	7				
ELL	12	31		42	63						
BLK	25	49	47	32	45	43	19				
HSP	35	44		47	59		29				
MUL	53	38		59	62						
WHT	45	56		47	50		64				
FRL	30	49	44	37	48	50	29				
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	19	38	47	29	41	35	26				
ELL	21	50		48	67						
BLK	26	44	42	38	49	35	47				
HSP	28	45	38	53	68		43				
MUL	33	43		61	71						
WHT	55	56		63	70		81				
FRL	31	46	47	44	56	40	53				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	52	46	24	42	33	28				
ELL	10	36	40	38	64						
BLK	31	52	47	31	43	49	40				
HSP	27	29		33	47	46	50				
MUL	56	60		61	40						
WHT	45	60		46	49		56				
FRL	32	48	47	33	40	39	42				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
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	52
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	41
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 accountability area that showed the lowest performance is ELA. Contributing factors to the data include lots of transition in faculty with in third grade ELA along with 95% of the students entering the 3rd grade as non proficient readers. As a result, our instructional focus at the beginning of the year was geared toward phonics instruction versus strategies that would assist students in reading and understanding texts.

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

The accountability area with the greatest decline was science with a 25% decline in proficiency. One factor that contributed to this decline include teacher concerns (one teacher hadn't taught science in the past few years and one teacher who went on maternity leave for three months). Another contributing factor is the students' lack of

knowledge of prerequisite science concepts which has to be applied or synthesized with fifth grade science standards.

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

The data point that exhibited the widest gap from the school and state comparison was ELA proficiency. This is 27% gap. Contributing factors to this gap include majority of our students entering the intermediate grades as non-proficient readers. This creates the greatest barrier for adequate growth needed to show proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the lower performing quartile students for math. Actions that were taken in this areas include constant monitoring of assessment data for students in the LPQ along with planning with teachers and making instructional shifts as needed to ensure that students are showing growth towards mastering mathematical content as it taught.

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

One early warning systems that is alarming is the number of intermediate students with two or more indicators. The number of students with early warning systems doubles as the students get older. Another indicator that is an area of concern is the number of students with at least one retention.

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

1. Increase LPQ gains in ELA
2. Increase learning fgains in ELA
3. Increase LPQ gains in Math
4. Increase learning gains in Math
5. Increase Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our data, the first goal of focus is sharpening and increasing the consistency and fidelity of our Tier II instruction for reading. The data shows the lack of consistent, well-planned, small group instruction is negatively impacting our students' academic growth.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year, 60% of students in the lower performing quartile in reading at Jacksonville Heights Elementary School will exhibit a year's growth as evidenced by their scale score on the 2021 FSA Reading Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use researched-based resource for If we maintain consistent, reliable reading resources during small group, reading instruction. We will implement Corrective Reading for 3rd – 5th grade students. Reading Mastery will be used as a reading intervention for kindergarten through second grade students. The reading coach will design, monitor, and assess reading achievement progress weekly/biweekly. The reading coach will provide professional development, as well as complete coaching cycles with teachers as needed. The reading interventionist will provide differentiated instruction based on bi-weekly/monthly data analysis. The reading interventionist will used several researched-based resources and strategies including but not limited to Corrective Reading, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and guided reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention System (LLI) is a small-group, supplementary intervention system designed for children who find reading and writing difficult. LLI is designed to bring children quickly up to grade-level competency, 14-18 weeks on average. Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery will be used simultaneously with LLI instruction. LLI is a multi-faceted program which requires students to critically think about texts before, during and after reading. Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery primary focus is phonics instruction. The two programs will provide our students with strategies needed to become fluent readers with a skill set which will assist them in critically reading and understanding texts from a variety of genres.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide a TDE for members of the administration and instructional support team to attend training on how to monitor Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Provide substitutes so teachers can attend training on how to implement Corrective Reading and/or Reading Mastery.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Create a professional development plan with a focus on using student data to plan and implement differentiated learning tasks for whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Provide substitutes for teachers to meet with administration and the instructional support team to have extended time to collaborate and plan learning tasks for students that are aligned with the depth of

preidentified standards. Data from informal and formal assessments will be used in these planning sessions to ensure that targeted remediation is implemented.

Person Responsible   Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Monitor all assessments and create reports for the administration/instructional support team to review and discuss. Based upon the data presented, the admin/instructional support team will determine next steps to deploy supports for teachers and students.

Person Responsible   Lashanda Palmer (belll2@duvalschools.org)

Implement the professional development plan.

Person Responsible   Yolanda Walker (walkery@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will focus on increasing learning gains of all students and lowest perfroming quartile students in math. Undersrtanding and applying mathematical practices and mathematical facts are needed skills in today's society. It is important for students to be able to compute and reason mathematically for daily functions in their K-12 education and beyond.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year, 60% of students in the lower performing quartile in math at Jacksonville Heights Elementary School will exhibit a year's growth as evidenced by their scale score on the 2021 FSA math assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Unpacking standards and planning daily small group instruction as it relates to targeted standards. Weekly observations with feedback concerning Acaletics instruction. Ensure teachers are knowledgeable of all resources at the beginning of the school year. Common Planning sessions will include reviewing lessons and assessments for proper alignment and remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will know and understand all materials and resources available at the beginning of the school year. Weekly common planning sessions will be used to strategically plan lessons and assessments. Researched based supplemental materials, such as Acaletics, and training will be provided for teachers to support them in providing effective math instruction during whole group and differentiated centers.

Action Steps to Implement

Plan with teachers weekly for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Monitor students' progress as evidenced by their performance on formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Monitor instruction and provide support to teachers based on walkthorughs, informals, and annual evaluations.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Purchase materials. Train teachers on how to effectively implement materials. Monitor the fidelity of implementation.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students are required to show a command of scientific concepts and their integration throughout their K-12 educational experience. We must provide our students with a solid foundation of scientific vocabulary and concepts in order for them to be successful in later grades.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, 45% of the fifth grade students at Jacksonville Heights Elementary will be proficient in science as evidenced by an achievement level of 3 or higher on the state's science assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Students will receive targeted, small group instruction at least twice a week. Groups will be flexible as students master content or receive additional remediation on presented content. 2. Students will participate in interactive, engaging technology infused science lessons. 3. Supplemental materials will be purchased to support science instruction. Materials to be purchased include but aren't limited to Performance Coach, Study Island, AIMS, Penda Learning, and other engaging web-based programs that support student learning. 4. Purchase kid friendly, content rich science leveled books for independent reading. 5. Provide field experiences for grades K-5. 6. Tutoring for students after SAI funds are expended. 7. Secure subs for teachers to provide time for collaborative planning which will focus on data analysis and lesson planning. 8. Students receive embedded science support in ELA classes through practice with vocabulary strategies and reading comprehension through non-fiction articles on Achieve 3000 and other text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies are paramount for the success of all students. The strategies listed will provide safety nets for all students as knowledge of scientific concepts are learned. It will also provide an engaging way to introduce new science concepts. The listed strategies will increase and strengthen students' exposure and understanding of scientific vocabulary. With the integration of the science strategies, students will be able to make connections and apply scientific knowledge to multiple content areas. This approach also provides a framework for concrete and consistent teaching of science concepts in all grade levels.

Action Steps to Implement

Plan with teachers weekly for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Purchase materials, train teachers on how to effectively implement materials, and monitor the fidelity of implementation.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Plan field experience for students.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Monitor students' progress as evidenced by their performance on formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Work collaboratively with the district science coach in our region to assist us with planning lessons and activities that are and engaging.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Partner with MOSH and other agencies to provide on-site science experiences.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Partner with local colleges universities with students who are science majors to provide students real world connections to science.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Students will participate in science discovery camps on early release Wednesdays. Students will explore concepts through various methods: vocabulary, hands-on experiments, non-fiction text, technology and wellness. These Wednesday sessions increase the motivation to learn and increase students knowledge of content. Students will reflect and respond.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standards aligned instruction is needed to ensure all students are provided equivalent experiences with on or above grade level content. Majority of our classrooms provide instruction as prescribed by the district's curriculum guides. However, following the curriculum guide in isolation doesn't provide the necessary supports and enrichment to ensure all students are able to read at or above grade level. Teachers need support in planning effective lessons as well as see their peers as a resource for lesson planning and implementation.
Measurable Outcome:	All content core teachers will actively participate in professional development that will focus on planning and implementing highly engaging lesson plans.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement professional learning communities (PLC) with a focus on planning highly engaging lessons that have tasks which are aligned with the state assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs provide opportunities for teachers to grow professionally. In PLCs, teachers grow together and students are positively impacts student achievement. Our work will be centered around Richard DuFour's work on PLC, specifically, Learning by Doing, Professional Learning Communities at Work, and Better Learning through Structured Teaching, Growth Mindset by Carol Dweck and Opportunity Myth by The New Teacher Project.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide readings from the authors listed above to all members of the administration team.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Meet to review finding from readings and create a grade level specific professional development plan for the first half of the school year.

Person Responsible	Andrea Williams Scott (williamsa7@duvalschools.org)

Begin implementation of the professional development plans.

Person Responsible	Yolanda Walker (walkery@duvalschools.org)

Prior to the end of the first quarter, conduct classroom walkthroughs with grade level/department chairpersons focused on grade level specific look-fors from PLCs.

Person Responsible	Lashanda Palmer (belll2@duvalschools.org)

At the end of the first quarter, revisit each grade level's professional development plan. Make adjustments based upon the learning that has taken place. Each grade level chairperson will be involved in this revision process.

Person Responsible	Lashanda Palmer (belll2@duvalschools.org)

Continue to implement and revise professional development plans along with classroom walkthroughs. Classroom walkthroughs will include on grade level observations as well as vertical grade level observations.

Person Responsible   Yolanda Walker (walkery@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

• Science Teacher - Title I funds will fund an additional core subject area teacher to address an area of weakness within our school's achievement. Science has been an area of decline for our school in recent years and in order to address this, we are adding a dedicated science teacher to our budget to work with students on learning the scientific method and meeting the rigors of the NGSSS.
• Parent Liaison - Title I funds will be used to fund a parent liaison who bridges the gap between home and school. The parent liaison will assist with PFEP events, helping parents navigate the school system, and provide parents with additional support on obtaining resources they may need (ie. families in transition, etc.)
• Media Specialist - Title I funds will be utilized to fund a media specialist to support core language arts instruction in the classrooms through activities in the media center that address ELA standards across all grade levels. The media specialist will also support teachers in locating materials on hand within the school that they may need for classroom instruction and remediation.
* Reading Coach - Title I funds will utilized to fund a reading coach. The reading coach will be the primary person responsible for providing professional development. The reading coach will complete coaching cycles on a variety of topics including data disaggregation, planning and implementing effective reading lessons, planning and implementing small group lessons, and classroom management. Majority of our reading teachers in intermediate grades have been teaching reading less than five years. The reading coach's role is vital as she is responsible for building teacher capacity of the intermediate reading teachers while providing prescriptive supports for intermediate students.
* Instructional Technology - Title I funds will be utilized to purchase instructional technology to increase student engagement. Technology to be purchased includes but is not limited to: Mimos, clicker systems, technology for recording lessons, etc.
* Supplemental Instructional Materials - Title I funds will be utilized to purchase materials for teachers to use with students during small group instruction. In addition, materials will be purchased to enhance whole group instruction and materials for students to use in independent centers. Other materials to be purchased include but aren't limited to: books for classroom libraries, Flowcabulary subscriptions, Reading A-Z materials and math manipulatives.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We plan to build positive relationships with the community by asking for feedback about events we hosted last year, as well as asking what the parents would like for us to present in the form of workshops/school events this school year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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