

Duval County Public Schools

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership



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 | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Casey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 30% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (80%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 |

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | No | 17% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 45% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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.

n/a

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Julia Landon College Preparatory and Leadership Development School is to create college bound students with a deep commitment to public service and a true understanding of their leadership skills within the global community.

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Bourgholtzer, MiChelle | Dean | |
| Bledsoe, Katrina | Principal | |
| Bell, Michelle | Assistant Principal | |
| Oliver, Tracey | Assistant Principal | |
| Mah, Erin | Teacher, ESE | |
| | | |
| Greene, Tracey | School Counselor | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/6/2020, Ryan Casey

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 30% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (80%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 | 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 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/6/2020

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 39 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | |

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 | 19 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | |

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 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 47 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 39 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

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 | 19 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

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 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 47 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |

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 | 86% | 43% | 54% | 87% | 41% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 68% | 49% | 54% | 76% | 48% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 59% | 45% | 47% | 63% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 91% | 49% | 58% | 91% | 44% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 78% | 50% | 57% | 81% | 49% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 72% | 47% | 51% | 76% | 46% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 88% | 44% | 51% | 90% | 45% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 97% | 68% | 72% | 94% | 65% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (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 |
| 06 | 2019 | 83% | 47% | 36% | 54% | 29% |
| | 2018 | 88% | 44% | 44% | 52% | 36% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 86% | 44% | 42% | 52% | 34% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 41% | 43% | 51% | 33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 88% | 49% | 39% | 56% | 32% |
| | 2018 | 88% | 51% | 37% | 58% | 30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 91% | 51% | 40% | 55% | 36% |
| | 2018 | 80% | 42% | 38% | 52% | 28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 87% | 47% | 40% | 54% | 33% |
| | 2018 | 91% | 50% | 41% | 54% | 37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 0% | 32% | -32% | 46% | -46% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -91% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 88% | 40% | 48% | 48% | 40% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 44% | 41% | 50% | 35% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 67% | -67% | 67% | -67% |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 97% | 69% | 28% | 71% | 26% |
| 2018 | 95% | 84% | 11% | 71% | 24% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 91% | 57% | 34% | 61% | 30% |
| 2018 | 87% | 61% | 26% | 62% | 25% |
| Compare | | 4% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 61% | 39% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 99% | 57% | 42% | 56% | 43% |
| Compare | | 1% | | | |

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 | 44 | 38 | 27 | 69 | 71 | 66 | 42 | 95 | 71 | | |
| ELL | 54 | 46 | 55 | 69 | 54 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 93 | 74 | 58 | 97 | 84 | | 100 | 97 | 98 | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 71 | 58 | 57 | 75 | 66 | 65 | 68 | 93 | 78 | | |
| HSP | 71 | 56 | 44 | 86 | 77 | 70 | 90 | 91 | 96 | | |
| MUL | 84 | 71 | 64 | 86 | 82 | 73 | | 94 | 100 | | |
| WHT | 90 | 70 | 64 | 96 | 80 | 76 | 91 | 100 | 94 | | |
| FRL | 68 | 61 | 63 | 76 | 68 | 64 | 76 | 92 | 79 | | |
| 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 | 64 | 71 | 63 | 58 | 51 | 33 | 46 | 75 | 38 | | |
| ASN | 97 | 81 | 89 | 98 | 82 | 73 | 92 | 100 | 96 | | |
| BLK | 71 | 60 | 55 | 78 | 67 | 63 | 78 | 91 | 75 | | |
| HSP | 65 | 65 | 46 | 81 | 66 | 57 | 76 | 92 | 88 | | |
| MUL | 89 | 81 | | 95 | 75 | | | 100 | 100 | | |
| WHT | 92 | 76 | 77 | 89 | 68 | 52 | 88 | 96 | 91 | | |
| FRL | 70 | 64 | 59 | 73 | 57 | 53 | 71 | 92 | 70 | | |
| 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 | 58 | 57 | 48 | 55 | 73 | 68 | | 81 | | | |
| ASN | 95 | 81 | 69 | 96 | 93 | 82 | 100 | 100 | 97 | | |
| BLK | 72 | 63 | 56 | 79 | 70 | 69 | 78 | 96 | 85 | | |
| HSP | 82 | 72 | 58 | 86 | 79 | 71 | 89 | 88 | 95 | | |
| MUL | 95 | 79 | | 87 | 84 | 67 | 76 | 90 | 78 | | |
| WHT | 91 | 79 | 66 | 95 | 83 | 84 | 93 | 93 | 98 | | |
| FRL | 72 | 66 | 50 | 76 | 73 | 65 | 83 | 81 | 84 | | |

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 | 81 |
| 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 | 732 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 58 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 56 |
| 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 | 88 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 70 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 76 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 82 |
| 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 | 85 |
| 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 | 72 |
| 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.

All questions need to be completed

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

-

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.

-

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

-

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

-

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

- 1.
- 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: After teachers have completed the standards based planning process and implemented their lesson plans they will ensure that they have a common standards based assessment. When teachers are assessing students after teaching a concept, the findings show that students who were already performing at or above grade level for reading proficiency continue to show proficiency in mastery of concepts presented in the assessment; whereas students who were already categorized as achieving below grade level for reading proficiency show a lack of mastery and/or adequate growth.

100% of our 2020-2021 core course teachers will engage in the usage of and implementation of standards based common formative assessment.

Measurable Outcome: PLC Formatting will be the same across all contents. The PLC format will include using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure that lesson plans created on every standard are aligned and include an assessment to know which students are proficient on the standard and which students are not, so that reteaching and reassessments can take place.

After common subject and grade level teachers engage in and implement instruction delivery rooted in standards, they are to collaborate on standards based common formative assessment, to provide their students. Teachers are to upload the assessment into Performance Matters, allowing for the ability to access the exam and data dis-aggregation. Assessments are to be given once a month or when a new standard is being taught. Assessments should be a minimum of 5 questions with a maximum of 15 questions (each question should also include the standard next to the question).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standard based common formative assessment will expose students to content specific test items, such as passages, graphs and content scenarios. Assessments are to be given once a month or when a new standard is being taught. Assessments should be a minimum of 5 questions with a maximum of 15 questions (each question should also include the standard next to the question).

According to ASCD, research on the use of formative assessment has shown that when teachers practice good formative assessment and students participate in it, both achievement and motivation increase.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The effects of good formative assessment on achievement can be as much as .4 to .7 standard deviations, the equivalent of moving from the 50th percentile to the 65th and 75th percentile on a standardized test. These effects exist at all levels – primary, intermediate, and secondary – and are especially noticeable among lower achievers.

The reasons of these effects are numerous. Formative assessment helps identify what students can do with help and what they can do independently. Participating in formative assessment involves students in active learning, keeps them on task, and focuses them on learning goals. Formative assessment, especially peer evaluation and self-evaluation, help students with the social construction of knowledge. But more important, formative assessment allows students to receive feedback on precisely what they need to do to improve. It shows them what to do next to get better.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development standard-based instruction as well as creating formative assessments. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible Michelle Bell (bellm5@duvalschools.org)

Formative Assessment: Rounds with content specific teams. (Pre-planning) with the expectation that teachers will offer a minimum of two formative assessments each month.

Person Responsible Tracey Oliver (olivert@duvalschools.org)

Administration will use Standards Based Walk-throughs to both observe and monitor the formative assessments that will be given. Teachers will be required to upload onto a school-based calendar when they are giving an assessment (Formative, Quiz, Unit Exam)

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

4) Administration will meet weekly to discuss the data we are seeing across our content responsibilities:

Are we seeing common assessments?

What does that data look like in performance matters?

Are teachers conducting an item analysis of the formative assessments?

Are teachers planning for a reteach or small group dependent on what the data says?

What are you having students complete?

Is the standard posted?

Are the students able to speak to the standard?

What equivalent experiences are students experiencing daily, weekly, monthly?

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

PLC Formatting will be the same across all contents. The PLC format will include using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure that lesson plans created on every standard are aligned and include an assessment to know which students are proficient on the standard and which students are not, so that reteaching and reassessments can take place.

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

Administration will hold themselves accountable by meeting weekly uninterrupted for a minimum of an 50 minutes about what we have seen in the minimum of 5 walk-throughs per week. We will additionally post positive feedback for teachers to see what we see going on in each content area. These positive postings will be based on the dials of the continuum (Calibrated Administration, Collaborative Administration, Standards-based Planning, Aligned Observations).

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Approximately 38% of students who participate in the survey indicated that they feel very safe when in the hallways of the school. This was a 2% decline from the previous year survey results. Additionally, approximately 62% of students who participated in the survey indicated they feel very safe when in teacher's classes. This was an 8% decline from the previous year's survey results.

Measurable Outcome: 60% of our 2020-2021 student will feel they are very safe when they are in the hallways and in when they are in their teacher's class.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: To help students become more accountable for their actions, we need to establish routines, procedures and structures while simultaneously offering students opportunities to observe the presence of school staff members throughout the school (as well as in classrooms) monitoring and modeling appropriate behavior and good citizenship.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to ASCD, research on safe schools. A school must be safe; creating this condition requires thoughtful and constant attention to the security and safety of the facilities; creation of clear policies and procedures for students and staff conduct; frequent and effective communication with school and community stakeholders; and attention to classroom management as well as specific and relevant professional development. The absenteeism of these conditions in place, hinder student intentional learning and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development on the Supportive Environment – Student survey results and reflection. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Dissect previous year data related to ensuring a safe learning environment. School based professional development on student conduct expectations for common areas outside of the classroom (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Rounds with content grade level teams to discuss student expectations in classrooms. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Student grade level assemblies (virtual if needed) to review code of conduct expectations. (August 2020)

Person Responsible MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Approximately 56% of teachers who participated in the survey indicated that they feel it's ok to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with the principal. This was a 15% decline from the previous year survey results. Additionally, approximately 53% of teachers who participated in the survey indicated that the principal had confidence in the expertise of the teachers. This was a 12% decline from the previous year's survey results.

Measurable Outcome: 100% of our 2020-2021 teachers will feel that it's ok to discuss feelings, worries and frustrations with the principal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: To help teachers regain the confidence to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with the principal, we the administrative team will create an atmosphere that cultivates and facilitates productive collaborative relationships in our school building.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to ASCD, research on the trust factor, trust is the foundation for collaboration, and collaboration is what makes organizations excel. The Principal and the Administrative Team are responsible for creating conditions that fosters trust through collaborations. This is a collective effort which requires thoughtful and constant attention to the social and emotional wellbeing of all teachers and faculty members. Ultimately, the principal and teachers must develop a climate and culture of trust in order to maximize student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development based on the Effective Leaders – Student survey results and reflection. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

Dissect previous year data related to ensure Effective Leadership. School based professional development on activities that cultivate and foster trust on and off the school campus. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible Michelle Bell (bellm5@duvalschools.org)

Develop social and emotion norms among the Administrative Team and the Teachers. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible Tracey Oliver (olivert@duvalschools.org)

Administrative Team collectively develop and maintain an open-door policy which manifests integrity and transparency. (August 2020)

Person Responsible Katrina Bledsoe (harmerk@duvalschools.org)

24) Provide the teachers will a system to submit suggestions and concerns that will be address with frequency.

Person Responsible Michelle Bell (bellm5@duvalschools.org)

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.

na

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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