

Duval County Public Schools

Arlington Heights 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Arlington Heights Elementary School

1520 SPRINKLE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

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

Demographics

Principal: Katrice Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (34%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Arlington Heights Elementary School

1520 SPRINKLE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

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

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	86%

School Grades History

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

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Scott, Vondeira	Principal	Ensures the highest academic standards and a safe and secure learning environment for all students. Leads, manages, supervises, and administers all programs, policies and activities of the school. Monitors instruction, ensures implementation of district curriculum and assesses effectiveness of instructional and support personnel.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/25/2019, Katrice Scott

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (34%)
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	
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

Wednesday 7/15/2020

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	46	53	36	55	49	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	9	17	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	16	19	17	23	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	

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	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	46	53	36	55	49	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	9	17	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	16	19	17	23	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	39%	50%	57%	33%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	53%	60%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	63%	39%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	63%	62%	33%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	48%	53%	20%	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	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
	2018	20%	50%	-30%	57%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	35%	50%	-15%	56%	-21%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		31%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
05	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	49%	-12%	53%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
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	19	41	29	35	56	56	29				
ELL	27	44		62	65		15				
BLK	38	50	40	61	73	59	44				
HSP	39	58		74	80		27				
WHT	38	52		59	91		55				
FRL	43	56	42	65	76	62	47				
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	16	47		26	41						
ELL	7	44	47	31	48	45					
BLK	22	44	50	35	43	54	31				
HSP	36	56		47	36		73				
WHT	42	50		65	66		64				
FRL	32	50	43	45	52	50	50				
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	7	53	55	17	24						
ELL	7	55		31	32		10				
BLK	31	61	67	32	34	38	21				
HSP	29	54		41	19		13				
WHT	41	52		45	39		21				
FRL	33	57	57	39	34	41	18				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	52
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	56
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	
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	59
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	58
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.

Our Students With Disabilities showed the lowest performance and is an area of focus. In 2018-2019, we had 19% scoring a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA assessment. This is an increase from 16% proficient in 2017-2018. This subgroup has historically performed lower than any other group at the school. A major contributing factor is the below grade level reading for these students. On the FSA Math assessment, the same group of students showed an increase from 26% in 2017-2018 to 35% in 2018-2019.

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

We saw a decline in ELA learning gains for our SWD from 47% in 2017-2018 to 41% in 2018-2019. Additionally, our learning gains from our bottom quartile students' declined from 48% in 2017-2018 to 36% in 2018-2019. Historically, these students display reading deficits and they require more intensive reading instruction.

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.

Reviewing grade level raw data in comparison to the state's average, the greatest gap is in ELA for all grade levels. In 3rd grade, the school state comparison is -19%, 4th grade is -20% and 5th grade is -21%. Our school achievement for ELA has improved but the increases are small. This school year teachers received professional development on deepen their understanding of standards based instruction and planning standardsbased lessons with the reading and math coaches. This was common practice this year during common planning. Common planning has been consistent over the past few years but the focus on standards based instruction was a priority this year.

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

Our math data for all grade levels showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019. In 3rd grade, we increased 31%, 4th grade increased 26% and 5th grade increased 1%. The school-state comparison for this year was 5% for 3rd and 4th but -8% for 5th. The increases moved us closer to the state's average for 3rd and 4th but not for 5th grade math. This year all 3rd-5th grade students were involved in Acaletics for 30 minutes a day. Monthly scrimmages were administered to the students and this data was monitored by administration and coaches. During common planning, teachers planned lessons with the math coach and really differentiated tasks for students.

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

For the upcoming school year, we will focus on improving attendance for all students. The leadership team will start the year with those students who had chronic absences in the prior school year. Each team member will be assigned a grade level and they will monitor those students as well as any other students who may exhibit attendance issues. The leadership team will report absences to the principal weekly and this team will meet monthly to discuss next steps.

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

1. Ensure instructional practices are aligned to the standards.
2. Ensure our SWD students are receiving scaffolding core instruction so they can successfully participate in grade level instruction.
3. Implement interventions and monitor students who were referred to the AIT from school year 2019-2020.
4. Increase parent and community engagement
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The majority of the classrooms lacked standard aligned instruction with comparable experiences to the standard. This observational data established a correlational relationship between standard-aligned instructional and proficient students.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of our current core teachers will engage in successful standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional delivery ensure that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Based on Standards Walkthrough Tool, our team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so that they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading and Math Coaches, along with School Administration, will facilitate common planning sessions with teachers that will focus on unpacking the standards to ensure there is standard aligned instruction, tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

The Administrative Team will use the Classroom Walk-through Tool to determine alignment of the instruction, tasks, and assessments to the standards, according to the Learning Arc. According to the observational data, adjustments will be made to the instruction, tasks and/or assessments to ensure there is alignment to the standards.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

Classroom observations will be conducted by teachers together with administrators after planning of a lesson for further professional development.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

na

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.

Need to complete

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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