

Duval County Public Schools

Abess Park Elementary School



2021-22 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 | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Abess Park Elementary School

12731 ABESS BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristin Shore M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 85% |
| 2020-21 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 (64%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (61%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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 | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Abess Park Elementary School

12731 ABESS BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>86%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>60%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | A | A | B |

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.

Success... All Students... All Standards

Provide the school's vision statement.

Abess Park Elementary School is committed to providing high quality educational opportunities that will inspire all students to aspire to learn, acquire the knowledge, and accomplish all standards.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Shore, Kristin | Principal | |
| Weller, Corinne | Assistant Principal | |
| Hayden, Amanda | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Crosby, Sharon | Teacher, ESE | |
| Denny, Melanie | Instructional Coach | |
| Wright, Mary Catherine | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Mollo, Wendy | School Counselor | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Kristin Shore M

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.*

30

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

592

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 43 | 84 | 77 | 86 | 96 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 1 | 1 | 75 | 87 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/28/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 87 | 90 | 106 | 68 | 93 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 545 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 32 | 54 | 44 | 24 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 29 | 54 | 51 | 30 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |

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 | 25 | 49 | 39 | 20 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |

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 | |

2020-21 - 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 | 87 | 90 | 106 | 68 | 93 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 545 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 32 | 54 | 44 | 24 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 29 | 54 | 51 | 30 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |

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 | 25 | 49 | 39 | 20 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |

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 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 63% | 50% | 57% | 61% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 65% | 56% | 58% | 52% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57% | 50% | 53% | 40% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 73% | 62% | 63% | 72% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 71% | 63% | 62% | 69% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53% | 52% | 51% | 43% | 48% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 68% | 48% | 53% | 63% | 55% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 51% | 4% | 58% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 52% | 12% | 58% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 50% | 13% | 56% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 61% | 12% | 62% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 73% | 64% | 9% | 64% | 9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 57% | 10% | 60% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 49% | 17% | 53% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

1st-3rd Grades: iReady Reading and Math

4th-5th Grades: Reading- Achieve 3000; Math- Freckle/STAR

5th Science: District Created Assessments- Baseline, Progress Monitoring 2 (mid-year), Spring Mock NGSSS

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 28 | 41 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 24 | 61 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 33 | 75 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 67 | 67 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 18 | 47 | 74 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 | 45 | 71 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 50 | 83 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 100 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 32 | 49 | 70 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33 | 48 | 65 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 46 | 63 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 19 | 38 | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26 | 24 | 63 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13 | 38 | 71 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 47 | 65 | 78 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 46 | 61 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 42 | 58 | 67 |
| | English Language Learners | 27 | 45 | 64 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 20 | 47 | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15 | 26 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13 | 48 | 48 |
| | English Language Learners | 9 | 18 | 33 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 69 | 73 | 77 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 65 | 70 | 70 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 67 | 59 | 73 |
| | English Language Learners | 40 | 60 | 80 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 45 | 61 | 77 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 35 | 47 | 63 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 42 | 50 | 65 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 40 | 60 |
| | Grade 5 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 79 | 81 | 89 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 73 | 73 | 90 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 64 | 68 | 83 |
| | English Language Learners | 33 | 50 | 67 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 51 | 73 | 82 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36 | 39 | 82 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 56 | 67 | 78 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 71 | 90 | 93 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 66 | 93 | 90 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 64 | 88 | 96 |
| | English Language Learners | 33 | 33 | 100 |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 38 | 65 | | 43 | 47 | | 39 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | | | 59 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 61 | | | 78 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 53 | | 52 | 60 | | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 70 | | 54 | 70 | | 70 | | | | |
| MUL | 59 | 50 | | 48 | 20 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 84 | | 77 | 72 | | 77 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 67 | | 53 | 58 | 36 | 56 | | | | |
| 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 | 37 | 65 | 65 | 47 | 60 | 52 | 41 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 60 | | 75 | 80 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 84 | 80 | | 100 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | 62 | 48 | 46 | 48 | 44 | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 59 | 64 | 74 | 75 | 64 | 54 | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | 80 | | 78 | 76 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 62 | 63 | 79 | 76 | 50 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 57 | 55 | 58 | 62 | 53 | 49 | | | | |
| 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 | 40 | 44 | 33 | 49 | 50 | 27 | 57 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | 75 | | 96 | 88 | | 90 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 41 | 34 | 48 | 49 | 34 | 48 | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 44 | | 70 | 64 | | 57 | | | | |
| MUL | 62 | 35 | | 71 | 65 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 61 | 62 | 81 | 78 | 62 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 47 | 38 | 62 | 60 | 36 | 55 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 488 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 46 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 70 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 50 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 65 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 45 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 76 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 54 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trend data indicates a weakness in math across grade levels and subgroups. This is a change in our data as we have trended higher in math for the last five years of available state assessment data. In addition, the subgroup data across content areas reveals our students in ELL are performing the lowest, especially in the area of math. Our students in ESE perform the highest in most grade levels/ subjects of reported subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our math proficiency is in the greatest need for improvement in grades first, third and fifth. Fourth grade students are performing at the same level in ELA and Math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Our math performance will increase with a small group focus on learning missed foundational skills, consistent hands-on problem-solving and automaticity. Our school will provide a primary tutor and intermediate Math Interventionist through Title 1 funding. In addition, an Instructional Coach will be

utilized to support teachers and small groups of students. Administrative Common Planning will include vocabulary alignment, building upon benchmarks between grade levels and equivalent assessments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our ELA performance is continuing to grow with higher proficiency at multiple grade levels and sub-groups. Improving our students ELA abilities has been a school focus for many years.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our school used Title 1 funds to provide a primary tutor and intermediate Reading Interventionist. In addition, we have implemented Reading Mastery Signature Edition in Kindergarten-2nd grades for two school years.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Math manipulatives will be utilized for students to gain a foundational understanding before moving into more conceptual understanding. Our tutor and Math Interventionist will be immediately utilized for students identified as having math learning gaps.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Through Administrative Common Planning weekly, teachers will be supported in planning benchmark/standards-based lessons that are provided to students through a learning arc. Small group instruction, vocabulary development, and equivalent assessments will be created. Teachers will be provided additional planning periods weekly, one of which will be used for grade level planning to align with Administrative Common Planning. Our Instructional Coach will be on hand to participate in PD, model lessons, gather resources, research strategies and work with small groups of students. Early Dismissal Days (75 minutes monthly) will be provided for staff to collaborate within grade levels, vertically and with our resource team.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

At the beginning of the 21/22 school year, we have a Math Interventionist and tutor already in place to avoid the semester delay in filling positions in the 20/21 school year. Additional technology (interactive carts) and math manipulatives have been purchased through Title 1 and CARES funds.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Less than 50% of the classrooms in our school provide on grade-level standards-aligned equivalent assessments of student learning. |
| Measurable Outcome: | 90% of our current core content teachers will engage in successful grade-level standards-aligned equivalent assessments. |
| Monitoring: | Grade-level standards-based equivalent assessments will be developed/reviewed/monitored in Administrative Common Planning weekly, weekly review of lesson plans, student data analysis and class/grade-level data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Kristin Shore (shorek@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Standards-aligned equivalent assessments ensure that students are mastering grade-level standards |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Schools must ensure that students are receiving grade-level standards-based instruction and mastering grade level standards as evidenced on standards-aligned equivalent assessments |

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with grade-level standards

Person Responsible Kristin Shore (shorek@duvalschools.org)

Collaborate with grade levels and Instructional Coach in Administrative Common Planning to create standards-aligned equivalent assessments; review standards-aligned student tasks, unpack appropriate standards, build learning arcs, as appropriate

Person Responsible Kristin Shore (shorek@duvalschools.org)

Collaboratively analyze student data post-assessment to provide needed interventions, reteaching, and/or adjustments to the standards-aligned instruction and equivalent assessment, if needed

Person Responsible Kristin Shore (shorek@duvalschools.org)

Coordinate teacher and data identified needed interventions with our Full-Time Media Specialist, Reading Interventionist, Math Interventionist and part-time primary tutor to streamline interventions for grade-level standards students have not yet mastered (positions funded through Title 1 funds)

Person Responsible Kristin Shore (shorek@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Attendance: Provide monthly rewards for students on time and present on selected days. Continue to inform families of the importance of being on-time and present daily and the negative long-term impact of missing school.

Student Behavior: Review the flow chart and school incident reporting system with the MLT to provide students, staff and families with a consistent response to inappropriate behaviors. Focus on behavioral intervention strategies at monthly PD aligned with the greatest need observed from the latest discipline data. Increase the usage of "Jags Bucks" to motivate students and imbed their quarterly visit to the "Jag Store" within the Resource Schedule to ensure all students have the opportunity to visit four times a school year.

Parent Engagement: Increase the timeliness and amount of communication provided to families regarding school events as well as extending our communication methods through Social Media and the GooseChase Online Subscription (purchased with Title 1 Parent Engagement funds).

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.

-Parent nights for Math, Science and ELA will serve as an opportunity for the school to share the curriculum of our District/school, assessment achievement levels and requirements and answer questions for families. Open Houses will provide an overview of academic and behavioral expectations and school procedures, including how to address specific concerns or needs.

-Through the use of our parent nights and business/ faith-based and volunteer partnerships, we will increase the attendance of families to each event as well as improve communication between home and school on an ongoing basis. We will continue to highlight our partnerships with local businesses and communities on our school campus, our website, school newsletters and at businesses/churches.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

-School-Parent Compact forms and conferences with teachers will be held in the first semester.

-Title 1 Parent Meetings will take place at designated times (to precede a parent night event) indicated to be convenient by our families on previous surveys. We will involve parents and families in an organized, ongoing and timely manner in the planning, reviewing, and improvement of Title 1 programs by inviting and

engaging parents in the developmental meeting, annual meeting and SAC.

-The Parent Resource room will be a safe space for families to engage in the school setting by hosting/ participating in learning sessions, checking out materials, utilizing supplies and resources and volunteering to organize or utilize non-perishable food items and coordinate with our business/faith-based partners. The advertisement of our Parent Resource Room will occur through Blackboard Communicator (email, text, phone), website, Social Media, flyers, events, and tours to increase usage.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |