

Duval County Public Schools

John Stockton Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

John Stockton Elementary School

4827 CARLISLE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Brannan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (67%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

John Stockton Elementary School

4827 CARLISLE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>21%</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>35%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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.

Our commitment to our learning community is to inspire lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Be a learning community where highly qualified staff, motivated students, devoted parents, and committed business partners work together to create a positive school culture meeting the needs of the 21st century student.

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
Brannan, Stephanie	Principal	The main roles of the administration team is to oversee the instructional and managerial processes of the school. Administration observes, supports, provides professional development and evaluates teachers and all other members of the school. The principal also oversees the school budget, professional development, school activities and engages stakeholders. The principal also engages with the students on a daily basis providing small group support as well as academic goal setting.
Doss, Angela	Assistant Principal	The main roles of the administration team is to oversee the instructional and managerial processes of the school. Administration observes, supports, provides professional development and evaluates teachers and all other members of the school. The Assistant Principal also oversees transportation, student discipline, professional development, school activities and engages stakeholders. The Assistant Principal also engages with the students on a daily basis providing small group support as well as academic goal setting.
Fulton, Sunshine	School Counselor	The main roles of a School Counselor, is to serve as an advocate for all students. She provides a comprehensive school counseling program that meets the academic and social/emotional needs of our students. She assists students with accessing additional resources needed to ensure they are successful in school. The school counselor also facilitates all of our Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings and Multidisciplinary Team meetings. As a former teacher and math coach, Mrs. Fulton is also able to provide instructional support to teachers and students as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Stephanie Brannan

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

450

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

3

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

3

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	69	78	61	68	72	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	3	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	1	4	9	4	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	4	10	6	11	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	4	4	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

Saturday 8/21/2021

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	64	74	70	83	82	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	8	25	13	10	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
--	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	10	30	22	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	7	19	8	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
--------------------------------------	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	64	74	70	83	82	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	8	25	13	10	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	10	30	22	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	7	19	8	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 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				85%	50%	57%	86%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	56%	58%	69%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	50%	53%	63%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				92%	62%	63%	92%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				82%	63%	62%	82%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79%	52%	51%	77%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	48%	53%	83%	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	82%	51%	31%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	87%	50%	37%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	88%	61%	27%	62%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	97%	64%	33%	64%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	91%	57%	34%	60%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-97%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kindergarten, first grade and second grade used iReady for both ELA and math.

Third, fourth and fifth grade used district created Progress Monitoring Assessments for both ELA and math.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	73	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	64	73
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	50
	English Language Learners	0	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	61	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	64	73
	Students With Disabilities	0	25	50
	English Language Learners	0	100	100

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	77	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	70	90
	Students With Disabilities	0	50	63
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	78	95
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	60	90
	Students With Disabilities	13	75	88
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76	83	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	78	72	76
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	69
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70	88	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	72	75
	Students With Disabilities	50	79	77
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66	77	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	57	62
	Students With Disabilities	36	29	36
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	84	87	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	64	54
	Students With Disabilities	50	64	46
	English Language Learners	100	100	100

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		76	73	79
	Economically Disadvantaged		67	53	71
	Students With Disabilities		27	36	30
	English Language Learners				
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		73	76	68
	Economically Disadvantaged		67	60	43
	Students With Disabilities		45	50	40
	English Language Learners		0	0	100
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		87	82	83
	Economically Disadvantaged		80	87	73
	Students With Disabilities		45	64	50
	English Language Learners				

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	47	10		67	60						
ASN	90			100							
BLK	61	50		69	53		75				
HSP	94			94							
MUL	82			71							
WHT	87	52	46	92	75		82				
FRL	64	50		64	64		71				
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	59	60		64	75						
BLK	64	45		83	74		40				
HSP	93			93							

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
MUL	100	70		88	70						
WHT	86	72	68	93	83	81	75				
FRL	75	68	62	83	68	71	65				
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	52	50		67	55						
BLK	79	64	70	76	80	60					
HSP	65			88							
MUL	81	71		88	86						
WHT	90	66	69	96	82	88	93				
FRL	84	68	70	88	85	75	71				

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	66
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	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	95
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	62
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	94
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	77
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	72
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	63
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?

We continue to struggle in the areas of reading and math gains as well as our lowest performing quartile. Not only are we losing out lowest performers but we are also not making adequate gains with our higher performing students. We also expected to see better writing results than we have so writing is still a concern.

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

Our ELA and math gains as well as our ELA and math lowest performing quartile gains saw double digit losses this past year. Both ELA and math LPQs are below 50%.

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

As with everyone COVID definitely played a role in our drops. We had a great deal of 5th graders moving from virtual to brick and mortar and back, specifically in 5th grade, which of course is where our gains and LPQ gains came from. We also typically have larger gains in 4th grade overall and of course without those gains this year, that did impact our scores as well. With more stability in our brick and mortar classrooms this year, we hope to be able to better address individual student needs.

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

In light of the pandemic, our 3rd grade students, who struggled considerably, still had a proficiency score of 85% on the spring 2021 ELA FSA, up 3% points from spring 2019. We Also saw single digit increases in 3rd grade math, 4th grade ELA and 5th grade science, which has been a concern for us as well.

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

We did place an emphasis on tutoring for 3rd grade students. We also supported 3rd grade students via small group instruction from administration and other personnel. Classroom teachers also placed an emphasis on differentiated instruction via independent folders since COVID restrictions limited center time.

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

Teachers will continue to utilize small group instruction and independent folders during center time to ensure they are meeting students at their level. We will also need to ramp up our small group instruction and ensure it is focused and intentional, specifically with our lowest performing quartile students.

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.

We will have a standards coach this year that will be able to not only provide the teachers and students support but also help provide professional development in the areas of guided reading, utilizing our new Benchmark Advance curriculum, and individualized support for teachers and students.

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

In order to sustain the gains we have made we will continue some of our same practices of small group instruction, individual folders, and students supports. We just need to be more intentional in what and how we do it. It is my hope the new curriculum will help to support our standards based instruction in order to ensure student achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our 20-21 ELA FSA data, when comparing it to the 19-20 ELA FSA data, we had a 15-point decrease in the area of ELA gains and a 22-point decrease in the area of ELA LPQ gains.
Based on our 20-21 Math FSA data, when comparing it to the 19-20 Math FSA data, we had an 11-point decrease in the area of math gains and a 34-point decrease in the area of math LPQ gains.

Measurable Outcome: With the help of our standards coach and the leadership team, we will work collaboratively with the teachers to ensure there is a solid understanding of the curriculum, standards, and data in order to adequately meet the needs of all of our students, so that we can improve our ELA gains from 51% to 70% and improve our ELA LPQ gains from 42% to 60%. We will strive to move our math gains from 71% to 75% and improve our math LPQ gains from 45% to 60%. Lofty goals but necessary at this point.

Monitoring: The leadership team will monitor the instruction to ensure fidelity via district standards walk throughs, classroom observations, informal and formal observations, student data discussions and through the use of data and conversations around the data via PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide teachers with content specific professional development during PLCs, common planning and faculty meetings to better equip them with meeting the needs of their individual students. The focus will be on standards-based instruction using our Standards Learning Arc Continuum to ensure a deeper understanding by all.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers have expressed a desire for more collaboration with grade level peers as well as vertical articulation. They have also expressed a desire for more differentiated professional development. This was noted on both the 5 Essentials survey as well as our school based end of year survey. This practice was put into place during the 19-20 school year and we received positive feedback from the teachers. We will continue this practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize the common planning time to effectively delve into the standards and ensure the tasks and assessments are aligned to the standards and provide for an equivalent experience allowing students to be actively engaged.

Person Responsible Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Back by popular demand.... Faculty meetings will be utilized to provide differentiated professional development based on teacher need and choice.

Person Responsible Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Our gifted lead teacher will work with our ELA teachers to provide them with options for challenging our higher performing students to ensure gains are being acquired.

Person Responsible Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Administration will provide support by assisting with small groups for LPQ students.

Person Responsible Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 20-21 FSA Writing assessment, only 38% of our 4th graders and 35% of our 5th graders performed at a level of 7 or higher. However, when looking at a level 6 or above, 88% of our 4th graders and 76% percent of our 5th graders performed at a 6 or higher. We have a large percentage of students scoring a 6 but we need to move them to at least a level 7.

Measurable Outcome: At least 75% of our 4th and 5th graders will score at least a 7 or above.

Monitoring: The leadership team will monitor the instruction to ensure fidelity via district standards walk throughs, classroom observations, informal and formal observations, student discussions and through the use of data and conversations around the data via PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: All K-3 teachers will be using the Writing City Research Based Program to ensure students are adequately prepared for 4th and 5th grade. All 4th and 5th grade teachers will use the research based program, Top Score, which will be incorporated into their daily schedule.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Although we have used this program for the last 2 years, I do feel like with COVID restrictions, teachers were unable to fully implement a writing workshop model that allowed for peer collaboration. We also had a lot of mobility with students moving from virtual to brick and mortar as well as several students in 4th and 5th grade having to be quarantined.

Action Steps to Implement

Standards coach and administration will also participate in the scoring of practice prompts. Sometimes seeing results through a different lens helps to activate new strategies.

Person Responsible Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

Administration will monitor the fidelity of implementation through walkthroughs, observations, and student work (practice tests).

Person Responsible Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

The master schedule will ensure that writing time is built into the daily class schedule.

Person Responsible Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

Third grade teachers will utilize the narrative portion of the Top Score Writing Program in the spring to ensure students have the rigor and are ready for 4th grade.

Person Responsible Angela Doss (dossa@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.

During the 19-20 school year, John Stockton ranked #1 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. We reported 0 SESIR incidents for the year. We had 23 discipline referrals for the 19-20 school year and 24 discipline referrals for the 20-21 school year. Our highest offenses for the 20-21 school year included intentionally striking another student and failure to adhere to safety considerations. Our primary area of focus for the 21-22 school year will be to ensure that we maintain a positive climate and culture with minimal discipline referrals and no SESIR incidents. Specifically, we would like to decrease discipline referrals by 25% by the end of the 21-22 school year. Our Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Team (PBIS) will monitor the school culture and environment. The team will meet monthly to analyze discipline data and discuss any areas of concern. We will look at the data in a variety of ways (race, location, offense, grade, etc.) to help us see trends or problem areas. Based on the data analysis, the team will determine if changes need to be made to our tier 1 interventions. We will also utilize our Multi-Tiered System of Supports Team (MTSS) to address any small group or individual student's needs.

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.

John Stockton engages the community in a variety of events such as our annual Thanksgiving luncheon, Fall Festival, Grinch Fun Run, STEM day, Art Day, Talent Show, Musical Productions, Book Fairs, awards ceremonies and School dances, just to name a few. We also engage the community via academic nights such as STEM Night and Literacy Night where we provide strategies and support to parents so that they can help their children at home and become part of the learning process. We also encourage community participation through our annual beautification day, as well as, our Career Fair / Touch the Trucks Day. These events did not exist this past year due to COVID restrictions. However, we are excited to be able to carry out these traditions in the upcoming year.

As a school with a large military population, we participate in weekly flag raising ceremonies every Monday, as well as, Month of the Military Child in April. This builds support for our military children and brings families together.

We are also fortunate enough to have a strong faith based partnership with Ortega United Methodist Church.

So that we can keep our community abreast of all of the events, we utilize various modes of communication ie... the school marquee, the school website, school newsletter, Class Dojo, School Messenger email and phone system, Facebook and a bulletin board in the main office.

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

We are very fortunate to have a variety of parent groups who work collaboratively with the school as well as each other.

Our Parent teacher Association (PTA) work tirelessly to ensure our students and teachers have events that allow for parents to take part in their child's education through academic events such as STEM day and Art day as well as through social events such as dances, Fall Festival and Food Trucks for performances.

Our Friends of Stockton (FOS) parent group is the driver of the heavy fundraising. With these funds raised they have assisted with the purchase of All in One monitor carts for all classrooms, iPads for all classrooms, science materials for our PITSCO science lab, just to name a few.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00